

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST TWA

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure many Members are aware, during the past year, Trans World Airlines [TWA] has been embroiled in an ongoing labor dispute with its flight attendants over their wages and terms and conditions of employment. TWA's chairman, Mr. Carl Icahn, has repeatedly been accused of demanding harsher concessions from TWA's predominantly female employees than from the airline's pilots and ground crew. Charges of age and sex discrimination are presently being considered by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Now added to the continuing controversy over TWA's treatment of its employees, are charges of less than fair representation and opportunities for TWA's black employees. I submit for my colleagues attention, the following letter from the Kansas City, MO branch of the NAACP, which details their allegations against TWA.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
Kansas City, MO, June 17, 1986.

Mr. CARL C. ICAHN,

Chairman of the Board, Trans World Air-
lines, New York, NY.

DEAR MR. ICAHN: I am sure that the majority of white employees were both relieved and heartened by your promise of an "open door policy" in your June 12, 1986 letter to all TWA employees. They understood that you were talking to them. Black employees understand also. They understand that you are continuing and expanding upon an "open door policy" which has always existed for them . . . an open door with an EXIT sign.

The purpose of this letter is to provide you with the perspective of TWA's black employees; a perspective gained through discussion and feedback—system wide. I am writing because I am a black man; because I have held and continue to hold a wide range of responsible positions in business and within the community, and because I am a long-term TWA employee with a long standing concern with the issues of justice, morality and "equality," especially within the environment of the work place.

Notwithstanding TWA's past, I believe that the black employees of TWA viewed you as a "new hope," a chance for a "fresh start." They have always recognized the difficulty of the game and have striven to play on the same team, despite varying degrees of rejection and resentment. But since your arrival, black employees have been faced with increasing disillusionment; they have come to the realization that they will not be accepted or treated on a par with their white peers. To date, your "open door" policy has brought about the following:

Blacks now comprise less than 10% of the total work force.

Blacks comprise less than 4% of TWA management.

Black Directors have been reduced by 40%.

Black Staff Officers have been reduced by 33%.

TWA has only five (5) remaining blacks above the manager level; less than twenty-five (25) managers, and less than two hundred (200) total manager personnel out of more than 5,000.

The figures can be found in the Department of Labor statistical records which also bring to light that TWA remains the only major public corporation to have never had a black corporate officer and the only major airline to have never had a black captain.

Based on more recent actions, it seems clear that Equal Opportunity within TWA is meaningless and your disposition toward minorities and females in general and blacks in specific is affirmatively negative. While blacks in direct line for promotion are being passed over, reduced or eliminated, whites, including those related to you or your adventures, advance. There continues to be no one within the Company hierarchy willing to stand up to these serious issues. Those who have in the past have been shown the "open door." Dick Pearson and I talked on numerous occasions and for whatever faults he had, he did understand the serious problem of race relations within this Company and attempted to generate the beginnings of a solution, beginnings which you, Mr. Corr and the rest of your team have been racing at breakneck speed to extinguish.

Of course we have been through this before, so what is the point? Well, you may be shocked to know that black people are also consumers. They also travel on airplanes to the tune of \$45,000,000 plus annually on TWA. With growing awareness, blacks are becoming less tolerant of, and more reluctant to spend their dollars with someone whom they cannot work as "equals." If we cannot attain a proportional representation within TWA, then we can withhold our patronage. I already know that like-minded support groups will rally behind such action. The Kansas City, Missouri Branch, NAACP voted unanimously at its membership meeting on Tuesday, June 17, 1986 to support all black workers at TWA and those who have been terminated. The decision of the NAACP membership was based on the number of complaints filed at our local branch office, and the ongoing under-utilization and lack of upward mobility of blacks within the Company.

For blacks at TWA, there is not a "new spirit;" rather, there is an old and ugly spirit with "new emphasis." As I have stated in previous correspondence to TWA's Board: "RACISM, individual or institutional, is a sickness which if not overcome can be just as deadly to the life of an institution as financial illness." You are quite correct that we are still an airline in crisis—terrorism aside. There is an internal corruption which will eventually bring about consumer action and employee public declaration of grievances against this Company in an official

and appropriate forum. It will happen because what you are doing is wrong, you know it is wrong and you continue to do it.

This letter is not intended as a threat. It is intended to officially advise you and your "selected" board members of my belief of TWA's illegal actions toward its black employees in violation of their civil rights. The Board has a legal obligation to all stockholders to attempt to end such activities or to face the same "personal" liability as the majority stockholder.

The contents of this letter will be circulated to every black employee and ex-employee that can be contacted. Should you wish to discuss this subject through your "open door" policy, the ball is in your court.

With best wishes, I remain

ZELEMA HARRIS,

President.

EDWARD D. LEWIS,

Vice President.

THE U.S. SPACE AGENCY AND THE NEED FOR AGGRESSIVE LEADERSHIP

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter submitted to James C. Fletcher, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA] from Daniel J. Fink, the Chairman of the NASA Advisory Council. I was impressed by Mr. Fink's correspondence, in which he addressed the council's concerns on issues critical to the effective revitalization of the American space program.

In the letter, the NASA Advisory Council breaks from its traditional role as budget analyst for NASA programs and expressed its "great concern as to whether NASA can any longer meet the mandate for national preeminence established by the National Aeronautics and Space Act." This assertion is particularly sobering in that the council is probably the most influential, nongovernmental advisory body of NASA. The council also accurately labels the effort to get the Nation back into space as "neither adequate nor sufficiently rapid." I believe Mr. Fink's statement has helped to crystallize the issues in a format that hopefully will charge the agency and Congress to take corrective action.

In examining the reasons that the council gives for NASA's shortfall, it is clear that Congress and the White House are equally or more to blame for the problems confronting the agency. In the correspondence, Mr. Fink identified several key problems: The Nation lacks long-range goals in space; NASA's technology base has been allowed to erode; the environment of confusion and uncertainty sur-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

rounding the space program was compounded by the delayed decision on a replacement shuttle orbiter; the budget demands of funding another orbiter could severely impede the rest of the NASA budget; and the lack of a rational plan to make available expendable launch vehicles [ELV's] to assure U.S. access to space.

The issues highlighted in the council recommendation to the administration are not new. In one form or another over the last few years, and especially over the past 8 months, these observations have been brought to light. The report of the National Commission on Space has provided the basis for aggressive long-range goals in space and suggested a threefold increase in funding for base technology. The Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences has voiced its strong concern that replacing the orbiter would have a negative effect on other parts of the NASA budget, particularly the space science programs. Congress has been concerned about the assured access to space issue for several years.

Some specific response to the NASA crisis is beginning to take form. The House space subcommittee has taken steps to fund a replacement orbiter and has recommended a comprehensive plan for assuring access to space by fostering a private ELV industry. The President's decision to replace the shuttle, but exclude commercial payloads from the future shuttle flights, is a beginning. The Senate space subcommittee has added \$20 million in its NASA authorization bill for basic research into the next generation space vehicle. NASA, in anticipation of likely policy directives, has initiated programs designed to improve its space science and space technology base. While these and similar efforts should continue and be encouraged, they reflect a piecemeal approach to coping with a major national dilemma.

Mr. Chairman, in many respects, there is no program or effort more important to the future of this Nation and the world than the space program. The potential for utilizing space for science and application is, like outer space itself, without bound. The ultimate achievement, I believe, is to tap the resources of the solar system, both in terms of the economic prospects and the wealth of knowledge, for the benefit and enrichment of life on Earth.

NASA is a good agency with an unparalleled history of achievement. Unfortunately, for a number of years now they have been running full steam ahead with no road map or destination. The Congress and the White House have been negligent in their duty for not providing adequate long-term policy to guide the space agency. I think my colleagues generally concur with this observation. This deficiency has been recognized time and again for the last 10 years, by experts inside and outside the Government. Yet here we are, 8 months after the *Challenger* explosion, paralyzed, incapable or unable of providing the U.S. space agency with a national space policy or the long-term goals necessary for fulfilling that policy. If Congress and the President cannot provide the necessary leadership, NASA will continue to go its aimless way, until another major tragedy occurs. I don't wish to see this happen.

This policy paralysis, I fear, comes from the threatening cloud of the Gramm-Rudman budget crisis. The frustrating reality is that we are fully capable of approving a comprehensive space policy agenda, complete with a package of broad goals and detailed near-term objectives without appropriating a single dollar. When our Founding Fathers wrote the U.S. Constitution, it had nothing to do with the procurement of Trident submarines, or the issuing of food stamps. The actual writing and the signing of the Declaration of Independence was of little physical cost to the treasury. But the statements in those historic documents acted as guideposts for our early leaders, as they still do today.

It is a similar kind of policy statement that is needed for the space program; one that will live through the centuries; one that will transcend the current wrangling over the deficit; and, most importantly, one that will instill the fire of motivation into a battered space agency to once again command the preeminent position in the global space adventure.

Therefore, I concur with Mr. Fink and the NASA Advisory Council that the delay in providing the Nation with a clear direction in space is unconscionable, especially when the dollar cost of formulating space policy is not at issue. The files of Congress and the executive branch are overrun with the building blocks of space policy. Now is the time to assemble the pieces into a policy statement that can take us into the 21st century and beyond. It is a deep regret that the Nation's leaders have not yet been able to do so.

Authoring space policy, however, will not be a simple or painless task. It will require contributions from Congress, the White House, NASA and other agencies, academia, educational organizations, and professional associations. There already exists a number of entities that could take part in the policymaking process, such as the National Security Council's Senior Interagency Group on Space, the National Academy of Sciences Space Science Board and Space Applications Board, the Space and Earth Science Advisory Council, and the NASA Advisory Council. Indeed, the expertise of these groups have proven their value consistently, year after year. Also, if Congress is successful, the National Aeronautics and Space Council, which was abolished in the Nixon administration, will be reestablished within the White House. Two documents serving as the likely basis for space policy formulation are the National Commission on Space and the report of the President's Commission on the shuttle *Challenger* accident.

If we are to achieve greatness as a space-faring nation, a substantial monetary commitment is unavoidable. It will cost money for a replacement orbiter and to fund the necessary fixes before shuttle launches can resume. A reinvestment in our technology base will require funding increases. Space science, which has been choked in past years, will need sufficient funding in order to maintain a comprehensive program. Deploying the space station, America's permanent outpost in space, will not be an easy or inexpensive task. An aggressive space program and the pursuit of excellence is a national challenge that will not come cheaply.

Many of my colleagues are committed, as I am, to the revitalization of the space program. But, if we are to be leaders in structuring a far-reaching space effort, we must be aggressive risk takers. The space enterprise is too vital for us to allow it to fall into the mire of political morass. The kind of rejuvenated space program that is envisioned by most policymakers requires real funding increases over the next few years, followed by level steady funding. The words of President John F. Kennedy in his now famous 1961 "Moon" speech, still ring true today, "If we are to go only half way, or reduce our sights in the face of difficulty, in my judgment it would be better not to go at all . . . there is no sense in agreeing or desiring that the United States take an affirmative position in outer space, unless we are prepared to do the work and bear the burden to make it successful. If we are not, we should decide today and this year."

The NASA Advisory Council's correspondence with Dr. Fletcher is a cold splash, forcing us to look at the crisis in the American space program. I have provided below a copy of the NASA Advisory Council statement on the Nation's civil space program. I commend these insightful words to my colleagues for their consideration.

NASA ADVISORY COUNCIL STATEMENT

The decade of the 1960s saw the Nation's civil space program flourish, with the Apollo program and its goal of placing a man on the moon by the end of the decade considered as a major element of national policy. National security (in the large sense) was well served, and public expectations were established and met as resources were provided to achieve the leadership in space science, technology, and exploration that were articulated in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.

Over the past decade, however, the untempered public expectation for the Nation's preeminence in space has not been backed up with the requisite resources. We allowed the past investment in technology to be consumed without adequate renewal; a bow wave of exciting space science projects keeps being pushed forward into an uncertain future as projects are approved on a success-oriented project-by-project basis; the full orbiter fleet originally deemed necessary was not built; and the Nation's space program became increasingly vulnerable to just such a catastrophe as befell it. At the same time, the constancy of Soviet support for its space program has enabled that nation to fulfill an impressive longer-term vision, a harbinger of more achievements to come not widely reported to the American people.

It is time to reverse this erosion of leadership and realize our legislated mandate for national progress based on a far-reaching, well-planned space program. Funding adequate to meet these objectives must be provided. We urge that action be taken immediately to restore the national space launch capability, including funding of an orbiter to replace the *Challenger*, and the acquisition of a family of complementary expendable launch vehicles for use as appropriate. A set of long-range goals such as those articulated by the National Commission on Space should be adopted to guide renewed investments in space technology, as well as the ambitious space science program that are already envisioned by our scientific com-

munities. In this way, NASA must lead the Nation into a new century of space endeavors and exploration that will be an inspiration for a new generation of Americans.

THE AIR FORCE SHOULD TERMINATE ITS CONTRACT WITH SHORT BROTHERS OF NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the 115 member bipartisan ad hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosigning a letter to Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger urging that the Department of the Air Force terminate the remaining phases of a contract it currently has with Short Brothers Ltd. of Northern Ireland.

At the time that this contract was awarded in May 1984 a bipartisan delegation of House Members called on the Air Force to secure a commitment from Short Brothers that they would adhere to the provisions of their law—the Fair Employment Act—which seeks to provide equal employment opportunities for both communities in that troubled land. This request was refused and predictably the results are in.

Short Brothers is Northern Ireland's largest employer. In 1978 it had a work force of more than 5,000 workers. Less than 5 percent of the work force was Catholic. As of August 1986, the work force grew to 7,000 workers but the percentage of Catholic workers remained constant at 5 percent. Almost one-third of these new jobs were as a result of the Air Force contract yet, the inability to have them distributed to both communities means the United States is indirectly subsidizing continued discrimination in Northern Ireland.

I believe it is time we terminated this contract. It is inconsistent with new elements of our policy in Northern Ireland and is not contributing to a lasting political solution. If you wish to join as a cosigner of this letter please contact my office by close of business tomorrow.

The text of the draft letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, September 10, 1986.

HON. CASPAR W. WEINBERGER,
Secretary, Department of Defense, the Pentagon,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY WEINBERGER: We are writing to urge that the Department of the Air Force terminate its contract with Short Brothers, Ltd., of Northern Ireland. We seek this due to the company's continuing policies which have resulted in blatant discrimination against the minority Catholic community in Northern Ireland.

On March 2, 1984, the Air Force announced that Short Brothers had been awarded two contracts under the European Distribution System Aircraft (EDSA) program. The total amount of the contract was estimated to be \$150 million over a ten year period. It is our understanding that about half of these funds have in fact been obligated. We should urge the Air Force not to exercise its option to purchase additional

aircraft from Short Brothers and terminate the contract.

You may recall at the time that this contract was awarded, a bi-partisan group of House and Senate members wrote to you to urge that the initial contract be amended to include a formal commitment from Short Brothers that they would adhere strictly to the Fair Employment Act of Northern Ireland with respect to all hiring and recruiting for jobs which would emanate from these contracts. Regrettably, this request was refused by the Air Force.

The fact is, since the time that the contract was awarded to Short Brothers, they have failed to meet the basic test of the Fair Employment Act by providing equality of opportunity for both communities in Northern Ireland. In 1978, Short Brothers, which is Northern Ireland's largest employer, had a workforce of over 5,000 persons. A total of 5 percent were Catholic. As of August, 1986 Short's total employment had increased to 7,000 persons, yet the percentage of Catholics has remained at 5 percent, despite the fact they comprise 38 percent of the population in Northern Ireland. It should also be noted that almost one third of the new jobs created were as a result of the Air Force contract.

With respect to recruiting policies, Short Brothers has actually regressed since the contract was signed. According to the Fair Employment Trust, during the nine months after Short Brothers secured the Defense Department contract, the proportion of Catholics recruited actually decreased by 2.6 percent despite the fact that the proportion of Catholic applicants increased from 17 to 26.6 percent.

In addition, Short Brothers refused for a period of five years to sign the Fair Employment Agency's declaration of intent to provide equality of opportunity in employment. In recent months, published reports have indicated that Short Brothers has allowed their facilities to be used by Unionist extremists for purely sectarian activities aimed at intimidating the minority employees of Short Brothers.

In our judgment, Short Brothers' policies and refusal to work toward improvements in expansion of opportunity for both communities is most disturbing. The Air Force contract was one of the largest ever won by Short Brothers. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the Department of Defense to terminate this contract before we allow any more United States taxpayer funds to be used to subsidize continued discrimination in Northern Ireland. Earlier this year, on a bipartisan basis, Congress approved legislation to provide a first time economic aid package for Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. Central to this legislation are certain conditions and understandings of the distribution of the \$120 million in U.S. aid over the next three years. This includes two provisions which we quote directly from the legislation:

"Disbursements from the fund—

(a) will be distributed in accordance with the principle of equality of opportunity and non-discrimination in employment without regard to religious affiliation.

"The President shall report to the Congress on the degree to which—

(2) the United States contribution to the fund is meeting the objectives of encouraging new investment job creation and economic reconstruction on the basis of strict equality of opportunity."

The ongoing Air Force contract with Short Brothers represents a glaring depar-

ture from current U.S. policy with respect to Northern Ireland and should be terminated on this basis as well as the aforementioned reasons.

We appreciate your prompt response.

TRIBUTE TO ASBURY UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF WASHINGTON, DC, ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I want today to recognize the 150th anniversary of Asbury United Methodist Church in Washington, DC. This church has had a long and distinguished history as a religious, educational, and social center in the black community of Washington, DC, since 1836.

The establishment of a Methodist church by a black congregation in 1836 is particularly significant when one considers that this was 27 years prior to the Emancipation Proclamation. The free people of color who founded this church, purchased the land at the current site of 11th and K Streets NW., and built a church in a time of racial adversity in this city, a time when slavery still existed here. The current distinctive gray stone church edifice was built in 1916, the place of worship of the 2,000-member congregation.

The far-sighted black leaders and members of Asbury valued freedom and education and used the church building to provide schooling at a time when there was no public education available for blacks in the city. The church housed schools for black children, later a high school, and adult night schools.

During the 20th century the church has continued to serve this community and the world by nurturing civic and religious leaders and providing financial assistance and sponsorship for mission efforts.

In 1936 on the occasion of Asbury Church's 100th anniversary, Mary Church Terrell, a Washington DC, civic leader, read the commendation of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt praising the congregation for contributions to black history.

In 1947 Asbury Church sponsored the first interracial housing in the city of Washington, an apartment building at 1619 R Street NW., the Raydon.

In 1948 the Asbury Federal Credit Union was the first in any church in the country.

In 1955 the then pastor Rev. Robert Morton Williams founded the Wesley Foundation at Howard University, the first of its kind on a black university campus.

In 1968 soon after the dedication of its educational building annex, Asbury began a free breakfast program for community schoolchildren.

In 1982 the Asbury-sponsored HUD section 202 housing for the elderly opened. This 147-unit housing development in a converted public school is a first for the Washington, DC, area.

In July 1982, Asbury sponsored and built a chaplain school in Monjama, Sierra Leone.

Asbury currently operates a weekly food pantry that distributes food to the hungry of Washington, DC.

Congratulations to the members of Asbury United Methodist Church for continuing the long, rich, legacy of service and contribution to this city and the world. Best wishes for another 150 years of dedicated service to Washington, DC, and the world.

TRIBUTE TO MONICA MORALES

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Monica Morales of Corpus Christi, TX. Monica is the national winner of the emerging Hispanic artists contest which is sponsored by McDonalds. A grand prize winner, Monica will visit Washington, DC next week to tour our Nation's capital and visit with Hispanic officials and diplomats.

It is a great honor for me to be the U.S. representative of this 7-year-old. Her winning picture depicted her upcoming eighth birthday party. It is drawn in magic markers and depicts herself, her mother, father, and grandmother at the party. A strawberry-shaped pinata hangs from the ceiling, and a birthday cake with candles is on the table. It is truly a great show of family unity.

Mr. Speaker, Monica won from a pool of over 1,200 entries. Her school, the Windsor Park Elementary School, is proud to claim this talented second grade student. I share that pride and am happy for her parents who will accompany her to Washington. Her picture will be displayed at the McDonald's emerging Hispanic artists exhibit at the Organization of American States Building here in Washington. I urge my colleagues to visit the exhibit and see this fine example of the contest's theme: "What My Hispanic Heritage Means to Me."

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM

HON. DAN MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 40th anniversary of a program which has consistently generated goodwill between the people of the United States and those of 120 nations of the world. It is a program developed at the initiative of a Member of Congress who had a distinct vision for peace. His vision was to increase mutual understanding and assist the development of peaceful relations among nations through international exchange.

This program, and the vision of its creator, Senator J. William Fulbright, remains strong. Since 1946, more than 155,000 scholars have participated in the well-known and respected Fulbright Program. Over 54,000 of these participants have come from the United States. It

is one of the finest, and best respected programs administered by the U.S. Information Agency in cooperation with a variety of private organizations.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, the Foreign Affairs Committee has attempted to examine which programs financed by the Federal Government contribute most to our Nation's overall public diplomacy effort abroad. In other words, which of the radio, television, educational exchange, arts, and speakers programs, contribute most to the world's knowledge and understanding of the United States and its policies. Consistently, the answer has been the educational exchange programs sponsored by the U.S. Information Agency. The most important of these is the Fulbright Program.

One of the strengths of the Fulbright Program is the bond of friendship it creates in many levels of society. Whether they be exchanges of teachers, professionals, artists, or other scholars and academics, Fulbright Programs create goodwill that lasts throughout the lifetime of a participant. In turn these academics and professionals can pass along their understanding of the United States to their students and colleagues, thus redoubling the benefits of a single exchange.

Foreign alumni of the Fulbright Program often become high-ranking officials in their own countries. These alumni include 30 Cabinet-level officials, 40 members of national legislative bodies, 10 Supreme Court Justices, 67 university presidents, 32 ambassadors, and even several Prime Ministers. These statistics demonstrate both the quality of the Fulbright participants and are also a reflection of the respect the program holds abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Congress, led by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has been able to lead the fight to increase our Government's support for the Fulbright Program. It is perhaps the finest reflection of our national priorities and of our Government's own vision of a peaceful future. I congratulate Senator Fulbright and those who work to implement the Fulbright Program on their fine record of accomplishment.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN ON MOTHERS IN THE WORK FORCE

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to my colleagues attention a recent letter by Barbara Newmark and Marlene Hammerman, president and vice president, respectively, of the National Council of Jewish Women, St. Louis section, which was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on June 14, 1986. The National Council of Jewish Women has been an active supporter of issues benefiting today's working women. Their work and support have proven of great value to all American men and women.

The letter follows:

MOTHERS IN THE WORK FORCE

It is a fact that 60 percent of all women who work are mothers; that 80 percent of

the women in the work force are of child-bearing age; that, of these, 93 percent are likely to become pregnant during their work careers. Thus, three out of four women will experience pregnancy in their working lives. And the majority of these women will be back at work within one year.

These women will be back at work because it takes both parents working to maintain the standard of living that their parents enjoyed on one income. Or, they will be back at work because they are one of the 10.3 million families headed solely by a woman.

In order for families to provide for the emotional and economic well-being of their children, working parents should be able to know three things:

(1) how much time they will be able to take off for the care of their new children;

(2) that taking parental leave will not jeopardize their jobs;

(3) that if their child should become seriously ill, they would not be forced to choose between the health of the child and their job security.

The proposed Parental and Medical Leave Act of 1986 would guarantee time off for a newborn or adopted baby, would ensure job protection and would continue insurance benefits during the unpaid leave, a necessity in the event of a sick child. This will promote the stability and the security of American families so that job security or economic security will no longer be traded against the needs of the family.

The National Council of Jewish Women, St. Louis section, is currently involved with a monumental nationwide study entitled, "Mothers In The Workplace," which will help us to better understand the specific needs of working mothers. Current available research and long-time interest and involvement in family issues particularly related to women and children lead the National Council of Jewish Woman, St. Louis section, to endorse the Parental and Medical Leave Act of 1986 as a means of bridging the gap between work and home.

BARBARA NEWMARK,

President.

MARLENE HAMMERMAN,

Vice President.

INCREASING THE BENEFITS OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES TO OUR SOCIETY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, we are now fully engulfed in the "information age." Almost every sector of our society has benefited by the explosion of information technologies; telecommunication technologies, data processing technologies, supercomputers and others. However, while these technologies have been developed at a rapid rate and assimilated into portions of our society at an equally rapid rate, the ability of these technologies has not been maximized, nor have our economic, educational or legal systems kept pace with the changes these technologies have brought to our society.

We are being confronted with a host of new legal and moral questions, which our current laws and policies simply haven't provided for.

Copyright issues resulting from the use of home video and tape recorders, computer crime, intellectual property rights, the use of computers in schools, the increasing demand for computer literate workers in the job market, proposals to restrict access to information—the list of issues which need to be addressed is growing every day. Yet, as policymakers, we haven't been able to broadly assess the impacts of information technologies upon our society, we have not been able to set our priorities, nor have we assured that we are focusing on the highest priority needs first.

While Congress has tried to respond to several issues individually, the result has been the development of a piecemeal and only partial set of Federal policies. Quite frankly, our Government and Federal policies have not kept up with the advancement of information technologies at all. According to the Library of Congress, from the 95th to the 98th Congress, we have passed some 283 laws which, broadly interpreted, fall into the area of information policy. This averages to some 60 to 70 laws per year and the numbers seem to be increasing. These laws have mandated Federal information systems, clearinghouses, or dissemination in some 99 different public law areas. These information management activities have ranged from radioactive materials, to biomass energy uses, to developing nations procurement opportunities, to elderly transport services, to runaways and homeless youth.

As our information services and communication abilities increased, so has our demand, and usually our dependency, on these services increased. And in many instances our society has greatly benefited. However, I would like to suggest today, that we have only just begun to use these new technologies and abilities to our benefit. The development of information services has often been conducted in a vacuum, for a specific use. Several needs are not being met. It is time we took a step back, assessed our current systems, services and abilities, and focus on how they could be expanded and used to meet the needs of a greater portion of our society.

Several studies have been conducted regarding the impact of information services upon our society, our changing needs, and areas where Federal policies have become obsolete or inadequate. Our own research organizations—the Office of Technology Assessment, and the Library of Congress—have put out some excellent reports. Yet, up until now, we have not taken the next step, that of developing a forum where industry, academia, and Government can focus on these issues and begin to develop a consensus on how to resolve some of these problems.

For years, I have called for the development of a body which could develop coherent, information policies. Since 1980, I have introduced legislation which would establish an Institute for Information Policy and Research. This institute would address national information policy issues, provide a forum for the interaction of Government, industry and commerce, and educational interests in the formulation of national information policy options. It would provide a focus and mechanism for planning and coordinating Federal research and development activities related to information sci-

ence and technology, and create a new position of Special Assistant for Information Technology and Science Information.

However, I am willing to support a more moderate approach: The creation of a 2-year commission funded for the most part privately, which would:

First, create a forum for discussions and targeted research on the present and future impact of computer and communications systems on our Nation and its citizens; and

Second, present critical alternative views and choices to the President, Congress, and the public generally, so that such views and choices may serve as a catalyst for change, and maximize the benefits of the information age to our society.

This proposal, S. 786, to establish an Information Age Commission, was introduced by Senators NUNN and LAUTENBERG. The Information Age Commission would include representatives from industry, government at all levels, labor, and education to focus on the complexities and multifaceted nature of our computer and communications society. Its report should serve as an invaluable resource to government, industry and educational policymakers, academics, business and labor leaders alike.

This proposal was considered and has been reported out of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs. Shortly, I will join two of my esteemed colleagues from Georgia [Mr. SWINDALL and Mr. BARNARD] in proposing a similar bill in the House.

I encourage all of my colleagues to review and support this first step toward coming to grips with the information age. We can only benefit from it.

THE MACBRIDE PRINCIPLES—A CRITICAL TOOL IN THE BATTLE FOR ECONOMIC EQUITY IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as chairman of the 115-member bipartisan ad hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs I have been long maintained that the solution to the problems in Northern Ireland must be a political one that promotes economic development for all.

In the past year, we have seen demonstrated progress on several fronts toward this goal. The British and Irish Governments gave their support to the so-called Anglo-Irish agreement which sets out a potential blueprint for a future political solution for Northern Ireland. However, most observers have cast great doubts on the ability of this agreement to work without some significant changes.

The United States has done its part without any question. Central to our involvement was the recent passage of two separate bills each earmarking first-time economic aid to Northern Ireland and Ireland. The first a \$50 million fiscal year 1986 appropriation and the second was a 3-year \$120 million authorization pack-

age. Each measure recognizes the importance of economic aid to the future of Northern Ireland. The authorization bill contains more critical language in the form of conditions and understandings on how the aid is to be distributed. This includes the fact that the aid is to benefit both communities in Northern Ireland and is to be distributed in a nondiscriminatory fashion.

The reason this language was needed in the legislation is because of the fact that blatant discrimination does exist in Northern Ireland. It is directed at the Catholic minority in the north, while Northern Ireland suffers from the highest unemployment rate in all of Western Europe at 22 percent, the situation is far more grave in certain cities where Catholics are in the majority. There in cities like Strabane and Derry unemployment rises to almost 60 percent.

For the past several years, a number of leading Irish political figures in Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland and here in the United States have been trying to address the problem of discrimination. Their particular attention has been focused on those American companies doing business in Northern Ireland. This effort has been led by the distinguished former Nobel Peace Prize winner, Sean MacBride. Presently 24 American companies employ 11 percent of the manufacturing work force in Northern Ireland.

Under the leadership of Dr. MacBride, a series of principles have been developed and named the MacBride Principles. They are guidelines for fair employment in Northern Ireland. They are modeled after the Sullivan Principles developed in 1977 as an alternative to divestment in South Africa.

I strongly support the MacBride Principles and believe the United States has a special responsibility to combat the problem of discrimination in Northern Ireland. It is important to point out that support for these principles is not equivalent to supporting disinvestment in Northern Ireland. To the contrary its stated intent is to promote increased opportunities for employment within both communities. At the present time the prospects for additional job opportunities are there with the infusion of new aid including that provided by the United States. Adoption of the MacBride Principles by employers in Northern Ireland will go a long way toward ensuring that jobs are distributed in a nondiscriminatory fashion.

On Tuesday, September 4, the New York Times wrote an excellent article on the MacBride Principles which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues. I believe the Congress should join with the several States who have adopted laws and or resolutions endorsing the MacBride Principles. As a long-time friend of Sean MacBride I commend him on his tireless efforts in this area. I also wish to pay tribute to the Irish National Caucus for their persistent campaign to raise the MacBride Principles as an important new element in American policy toward Ireland.

At this point in the RECORD I am including the article entitled "Push on Hiring Bias in Ulster."

The article follows:

[From The New York Times, Sept. 4, 1986]
PUSH ON HIRING BIAS IN ULSTER
 (By Steve Lohr)

LONDON, September 3.—Encouraged by the success of the campaign to get American investors to pull out of South Africa, a coalition of Irish human rights advocates and politicians is mounting a drive to prod American companies doing business in Northern Ireland to combat discrimination against Roman Catholic workers.

The Northern Ireland campaign would place American investors and companies, once again, at the forefront of a sensitive social issue.

The effort is based on the "MacBride Principles," a nine-point set of guidelines for fair employment in the predominantly Protestant British province, also known as Ulster. Drafted by four Irish activists led by Sean MacBride, a Nobel Peace Prize winner, the guidelines are patterned after the Sullivan Principles, which were presented in 1977 as an alternative to divestment in South Africa for companies doing business there.

HEAVILY INVESTED

The year-old MacBride campaign is trying to convince American states and municipalities, whose pension funds are invested heavily in American companies that do business in Northern Ireland, to support the principles. In addition, the MacBride advocates are marshaling support for shareholder initiatives that criticize the employment practices of selected American companies in Northern Ireland and urge them to support the principles.

Each company signing the MacBride Principles, for instance, would agree to make "every reasonable lawful effort to increase the representation of underrepresented religious groups at all levels of its operations in Northern Ireland."

Although there are no official unemployment figures by religion, studies have concluded that the unemployment rate for Catholics in Northern Ireland is about twice that of Protestants. Twenty-four American companies—led by American Brands, Du Pont, General Motors and Ford—employ 11 percent of the manufacturing work force in Northern Ireland. The overall unemployment rate in the province is 22 percent, the highest in Western Europe.

SECTARIAN BOUNDARIES

To be sure, the religious makeup of a company's work force tends to be determined by its location because the sectarian boundaries in Northern Ireland are clearly defined. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, for instance, has its facility in the predominantly Catholic city of Londonderry and its work force is about 60 percent Catholic.

Last November, President Reagan defended the behavior of United States corporations, saying he was "proud that Northern Ireland enterprises in which American money is involved are among the most progressive in promoting equal opportunity for all."

Nonetheless, the MacBride Principles go beyond the percentage of Catholic and Protestant workers to what opportunities they are offered once hired. And there apparently are enough questions about the employment makeup of many of the companies operating in Northern Ireland to give the MacBride campaign momentum.

Two states, New York and Massachusetts, have enacted bills endorsing the MacBride Principles, while the legislatures in New

Jersey, Florida, Connecticut and Illinois are considering measures on investment in Northern Ireland.

Several cities have also joined the campaign. Last year, New York City became the first backer of the principles at the urging of the Office of the Comptroller. The city's public pension funds have an estimated \$250 million invested in 12 American companies operating in Northern Ireland. In Congress, Representative Hamilton Fish Jr., Republican of upstate New York, is drafting legislation to support the MacBride Principles.

The threat of divestment is implicit in the MacBride campaign. The New York State law endorsing the MacBride Principles, signed by Governor Cuomo on May 31, for example, "encourages" the State Comptroller to invest only in companies that adhere to the principles. The state pension fund holds an estimated \$740 million investment in 12 companies doing business in Northern Ireland.

The experience of the Sullivan Principles, named for the Rev. Leon Sullivan, a Baptist clergyman and outside director of the General Motors Corporation, suggests that well-publicized efforts to use foreign investment as a vehicle for social change can lead to public pressure for divestment.

The New York City pension funds and church groups this year sponsored shareholder proposals urging seven companies to sign the MacBride Principles. The companies are American Brands, Ford, Fruehauf, General Motors, Hughes Tool, TRW and the VF Corporation. The corporations chosen are typically ones with comparatively few Catholic workers.

NO SIGNERS

So far, no American companies have signed the MacBride Principles. A key reason is that the British Government has maintained that certain affirmative action provisions of the principles constitute "reverse discrimination," which would be unlawful under Britain's Fair Employment Act of 1976.

That stance, however, has been questioned by a recent court decision. On May 12, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York ruled that American-owned companies operating in Northern Ireland would not be violating Britain's Fair Employment Act by signing the guidelines. The case came before a United States court after an American company dismissed a shareholder initiative urging it to sign the MacBride Principles, contending that the initiative violated the British law. Though the ruling has no standing in Northern Ireland, it does support the case of the MacBride advocates.

The MacBride Principles have stirred a heated debate in the United States, Britain and Northern Ireland. The backers contend that they give Americans a tool for direct action to combat injustice in Northern Ireland, drawing frequent parallels between their campaign and that directed toward American investments in South Africa.

"Just as the Sullivan Principles opposed racism in South Africa, the MacBride Principles give Americans a way to fight religious discrimination in Northern Ireland," said the Rev. Sean McManus, national director of the Irish National Caucus, a lobbying group in Washington. "Today, American dollars are subsidizing anti-Catholic discrimination in Northern Ireland."

SPECIOUS ANALOGY SEEN

Opponents of the MacBride Principles, including the Reagan Administration and the

Government of Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, argue that the analogy between South Africa and Northern Ireland is specious, and that the effect of the principles would be mainly to scare away badly needed American investment, worsening conditions for both Catholics and Protestants in the beleaguered province.

"Most observers will acknowledge that employment discrimination has existed in the past and that unacceptable vestiges of it still linger," Charles H. Price 2d, the United States Ambassador to Britain, said in Belfast, Northern Ireland, last April. "However, the MacBride Principles are wrong because they can do incalculable harm."

MacBride opponents say the British Government does not use discrimination as a means of repression, as in South Africa. Britain's Fair Employment Act was passed a decade ago, they note, and it outlaws discrimination on religious or other grounds. According to Catholic leaders in Northern Ireland, the Fair Employment Agency has done a good job of investigating discrimination, but it has too little enforcement powers.

MacBride supporters bridle at contentions that their campaign will undermine Northern Ireland's already troubled economy. "We're not asking anyone to divest," said Patrick Doherty, administrative associate in the New York City comptroller's office. "We're trying to get American companies to change their employment practices, not pull out."

POLITICAL AGENDA

Other experts on the situation point out that the MacBride campaign extends well beyond its immediate target of a collection of United States corporations. "The MacBride Principles are not solely directed at American companies," said Dr. Christopher McCrudden, a fellow at Oxford University's Lincoln College. "They are an effort to put affirmative action on the political agenda in Northern Ireland via American companies."

Some American companies have been accused of anti-Catholic discrimination. For example, the Fair Employment Agency found Ford guilty last year of discrimination at its Belfast plant, the first time the Government agency ruled against an American company for anti-Catholic bias. Ford is appealing the ruling.

"We have a policy of equal opportunity," a Ford spokesman in Britain said.

Another allegation, contained in the report by the New York City comptroller's office, was that American Brands' subsidiary has "virtually no Catholic males" in its work force. In Greenwich, Conn., an American Brands spokesman said the company was "committed to a policy of equal employment opportunity" and ignoring that policy was grounds for dismissal.

TACTICAL MISTAKE

Even some Catholic leaders who support the goals of the MacBride Principles said that they might be a tactical mistake. John Hume, leader of the Social Democratic and Labor Party, which represents the Catholic minority in Northern Ireland and advocates nonviolent change, has contended that however well-intentioned, the MacBride Principles would act as a disincentive to investment, which the province desperately needs.

"Taking jobs from Protestants and giving them to Catholics isn't going to solve the problem," Mr. Hume said. "That will just create other tensions. What we need is more jobs over all."

Yet, on the other hand, even within the Protestant community there is an admission that the MacBride Principles, if nothing else, have served as an effective pressure on the Government to bolster its efforts against religious discrimination.

In a commentary in July, The Belfast Telegraph wrote: "The MacBride Principles can be seen as a help or hindrance, but they have raised awareness of the problem and are getting a significant Government response."

THE MACBRIDE PRINCIPLES

Following is the text of the MacBride Principles:

In light of decreasing employment opportunities in Northern Ireland and on a global scale, and in order to guarantee equal access to regional employment, the undersigned propose the following equal opportunity affirmative action principles:

1. Increasing the representation of individuals from underrepresented religious groups in the work force, including managerial, supervisory, administrative, clerical and technical jobs.

2. Adequate security for the protection of minority employees both at the workplace and while traveling to and from work.

3. The banning of provocative religious or political emblems from the workplace.

4. All job openings should be publicly advertised and special recruitment efforts should be made to attract applicants from underrepresented religious groups.

5. Layoff, recall and termination procedures should not, in practice, favor particular religious groupings.

6. The abolition of job reservations, apprenticeship restrictions and differential employment criteria, which discriminate on the basis of religion or ethnic origin.

7. The development of training programs that will prepare substantial numbers of current minority employees for skilled jobs, including the expansion of existing programs and the creation of new programs to train, upgrade and improve the skills of minority employees.

8. The establishment of procedures to assess, identify and actively recruit minority employees with potential for further advancement.

9. The appointment of a senior management staff member to oversee the company's affirmative action efforts and the setting up of timetables to carry out affirmative action principles.

THE NEED FOR NEW YORK'S ENVIRONMENTAL BOND ISSUE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an issue of great importance to my constituents and all the people of New York State. The New York State Senate and Assembly overwhelmingly approved an important environmental initiative to help clean up the most critical toxic waste sites in the State. This environmental bond issue will raise \$1.2 billion for the cleanup of nearly 500 hazardous waste sites in New York State, many of which are located in western New York. Paul MacClennan, environmental reporter for the Buffalo News, outlines the

strong reasons for supporting this environmental bond issue with great insight in a recent article. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and thank the News and Mr. MacClennan for their leadership on this important issue.

The article follows:

FRONTIER HAS PLENTY OF REASON TO SUPPORT BOND ISSUE

(By Paul MacClennan)

Gov. Cuomo kissing a toxic dump?

Well, not exactly. But the governor will kick off a drive to win voter approval of the state's \$1.45 billion environmental bond act Sept. 11 in New York City.

Why New York and not Niagara Falls? Probably votes and media attention, just as the governor elected to have his Environment 2000 meeting in New York rather than on less expensive turf.

Love Canal might have been an appropriate spot for Cuomo to launch the fall environmental agenda, but then again it's not a time to quibble and it is significant that the governor will put his political moxie on the line, running both for re-election and backing a major bond act in the same campaign.

Looking at the hard political realities, it's probably important for Cuomo to wring every single vote he can out of New York City for a bond act.

The selling job in Western New York where it's hard to turn around and not bump into a toxic mess should be an easy one. Just offhand it's hard to think of a reason for voting against it.

Erie County, for example, leads the state in the total number of abandoned or inactive hazardous waste sites—121 out of the total 981 toxic dumps statewide. Niagara County is second in the state with 99, so in the two-county area there are 20 percent of the sites under scrutiny.

But numbers alone don't tell the whole story.

As State Environmental Commissioner Henry G. Williams points out, the Western New York area has some of the most seriously contaminated, most seriously complex sites—the sites that will take decades to set right.

The public, almost numb from disclosure after disclosure, learns of a new environmental indignity every day, whether it's dioxin contamination of the air or a new delay in an already delayed remedial project.

Williams was in town last week with some good news, progress on curbing industrial discharges to the Niagara River by a further round of tightening of toxic waste discharges. But with some 200 dumps still suspected of uncontrolled leaking of wastes into the Niagara, the bond act takes on heightened significance for voters in this region.

While Williams says he sees a general wage of approval for the bond act as he travels the state, there are some clouds on the horizon.

State legislators in the Catskills and Adirondacks regions are fermenting opposition to the act on the grounds that they don't like the \$250 million that will go for new land acquisition in the Forest Preserves. While the bulk of the money, \$1.2 billion, goes for toxic waste programs, the \$250 million will go for acquisition of land, municipal parks and historic preservation. Assemblyman Richard I. Coombe, R-Grahamsville, for example, says the bond act "leaves too much in the hands of the bureaucrats and does not address the concerns of local

governments." He wants the legislation to spell out exactly how much will be spent on each dump. Well, anyone who has watched the evolution of Love Canal knows that every time you sink a shovel in the ground the price tag changes.

This column had problems with an earlier version of the bond act—one that called for squirreling away industry dollars in an environmental trust fund for 10 years. That onerous provision is gone and now industry will pay half the costs. The 50-50 split is a giveaway to industry, but, once again, it's probably the best one can get in a democratic legislative process, given the heavy lobbying by the Business Council and the big political contributions.

The selling of the bond act will continue the week of Oct. 11 to 19 with a bit of hoopla drawn from the days of a former environmental commissioner, Henry A. Diamond, who biked from Buffalo to New York peddling a clean waters bond act all the way.

Commissioner Williams isn't proposing to follow suit, but said he will participate in a series of events. Bikers from cities and towns throughout Western New York will converge on the Buffalo area towards the start of the tour and then a core group of riders will move on to Rochester, where again bikers from surrounding communities will converge in an assembly focusing on the bond act. Thus it will go across the state until they reach New York.

A second caravan, this time in boats, will leave the upper reaches of New York near Plattsburg and sail down the chain of lakes and canals, finally assembling in Newburg, where the Hudson River sloop Clearwater will join in a pitch for the bond act.

"I plan to hop around, joining the bikers one day and the boaters another to highlight the concern about getting the money to clean up toxic wastes throughout the state," Williams said.

State officials must walk a narrow line, because under the Public Officer's Law, the commissioner said, the department can provide information, but can't shill for approval of the act. "We can tell voters that the bond act is on the ballot, but we can't suggest how they should vote," he said.

State officials have already met with representatives of 30 environmental groups, such as Environmental Planning Lobby, the Sierra Club, Great Lakes United and the Ecumenical Task Force, to review plans for the fall campaign and Williams said the program got unanimous approval. Much of the "selling" will rest with these groups that are free to campaign openly and actively for approval.

Area residents will have a firsthand opportunity to discuss and debate the bond act at a regional Environment 2000 meeting from 8:30 to 5 p.m. Sept. 30 in the Orchard Park Fire Hall, 30 School St. in Orchard Park.

Williams is scheduled to attend the conference, which, besides the bond issue, will deal with issues such as the Great Lakes Governor's Toxics Agreement, pesticide use, recycling and reuse of throwaway materials, toxic air contaminants such as dioxin, and Great Lakes fisheries programs.

A statewide view of the importance of the bond act will come at the Environmental Planning Lobby's statewide conference Sept. 19 and 20 in Albany. The theme of the conference is the need to restore New York's historic role in environmental leadership, utilizing the bond act as a rallying point around which a new coalition can be

built to halt the decline of the last decade in interest in environmental issues.

Toxic contamination takes many forms across the state. Hazardous wastes leaking out of Long Island dumps are poisoning the sole source of drinking water. Dumps containing PCBs and an array of other wastes are despoiling the Hudson River. Tannery wastes despoil the Mohawk lands of Gen. Herkimer, toxic wastes threaten Olean's drinking water, refinery wastes harm Wellsville residents.

One doesn't have to go far or look far for a reason to vote Nov. 4. The state and its citizens have a huge undertaking if they want to enter a new century with an environment worthy of New York's proud history and bountiful land.

**DR. DONALD MACDONALD—AT
THE FOREFRONT OF OUR NATION'S
BATTLE AGAINST
DRUG ABUSE**

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people have focused their attention on drug abuse as our Nation's No. 1 domestic problem.

At the forefront of our Nation's war against this epidemic is Dr. Donald Macdonald, the Administrator of the U.S. Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration. As a personal friend and constituent of mine from Clearwater, FL, I know of Dr. Macdonald's longstanding battle against drug abuse in our community, our State, and throughout the Nation.

Following my remarks, I would like to include a recent column by Dr. Macdonald written for the St. Petersburg Times in which he challenges the American people to pursue three important goals in our effort to prevent drug abuse.

First, he urges parents to do all within their power to raise a drug-free generation in a drug-free environment.

Second, he advocates efforts to bring about a complete and lasting change in social attitudes toward drug use. And third, he supports the mobilization of community treatment and prevention efforts to deal with drug users and potential users.

Dr. Macdonald and his family have personally been touched by the pain and fear of drug abuse. They have taken their experiences and shared them with the community in developing important programs to combat drug abuse. President Reagan recognized Dr. Macdonald's personal commitment to this effort and nominated him to serve in his current position in the Administration where he is a national leader in this difficult endeavor.

Dr. Macdonald has risen to the challenge by charting a course against drug abuse that will result in a successful effort to reshape the American views and attitudes toward drug use. I recommend Dr. Macdonald's column to each of my colleagues because I believe it captures the essence of our Nation's problem and the solution to the dilemma that is drug abuse.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Sept. 3, 1986]

**TIME IS RIGHT FOR THE WAR AGAINST DRUG
USE**

(By Donald Ian Macdonald)

When I lived in Clearwater, practicing medicine and raising my family, one of my children was touched by drugs. All at once a new reality entered my home and my life.

My wife and I, trying to help our son fight back, experienced first-hand the frustration and pain associated with drugs. There were all of the searching questions, the agonizing over the past, the strong desire to set things right.

Some of the readers of the *Times* personally know of the problems I am talking about. No one can tell my family that drug use is a victimless crime. We were victims, our son as a user and those of us who helped him through his ordeal.

During that time I learned that we weren't the only victims. The seller and the grower are dependent on a trade that must create victims to operate successfully. They fuel the pipeline and become hopelessly dependent on it for their livelihood.

There are other victims—workers who are at risk because of the users on the job; elderly citizens who are robbed so users can support a growing habit; those who die on the highway in drug-related accidents; and taxpayers who devote part of their earnings to law enforcement efforts against drugs. The list goes on and on.

But we don't have to be victims. Currently, we have a unique opportunity to stop drug use in America. Future historians may view this moment as a rare time in the chronicles of our country. Several disparate forces are converging in the war against drugs, and we can now make dramatic inroads toward reduction of use.

For example:

The clear, angry voice of public opinion has been raised to a level of urgency. In fact, polls indicate that Americans view drugs as our No. 1 domestic problem.

President Reagan is preparing to escalate his already considerable efforts. The President plans to marshal the vast moral persuasion of his office, and the legal power of the federal government to conduct an all-out war against drug use in schools, at the work-place, and on the highways and the streets.

In addition, the scientific community has conclusively demonstrated with clinical studies the harmful and addictive nature of drugs, dispelling the lies and mythology surrounding use of marijuana, cocaine and many other drugs.

Finally, the media has focused its attention on the problem, prompting countless cover stories and many offers of help.

After two decades of relative social and economic tolerance of drug use in America we are ready to mount an effort to put an end to the epidemic of foolishness and tragedy that has engulfed us. Of course, law enforcement officials and the federal government have labored endlessly, providing a fulcrum to eradicate drug use. But largely missing from the equation has been pressure on the lever—a sense of individual, personal urgency from the American public.

I'd like to see us return to the time not so many years ago when we didn't have to talk of drug-free schools and a drug-free workplace. We had them. We knew then that drugs don't mix well with school or work.

We must pursue three goals if we are to have a drug-free America.

First, parents must raise a drug-free generation in a drug-free environment. This creates a containment barrier against the firestorm of drug use, allowing it to smolder and burn out.

Obviously, this will require parents to take a more active and responsible role in educating their children about the dangers of use. We must be role models for them.

Recognizing our children's immaturity and the pressures they face, we must provide them with adequate support and protection. All of us should know the health risks involved with drugs.

Kids must know that marijuana is habit forming, and smoking marijuana may be associated with cancer, emphysema and heart disease. Marijuana produces long-term effects on intellectual functions, decreases sperm count with males, may interfere with fertility in females and can damage the body's immune system.

Cocaine is even worse. It is addictive, and snorting can cause nasal problems, sexual dysfunction, cardiac arrhythmia, convulsions, coma, respiratory collapse, paranoid behavior and death.

When used as crack, the effects are even more pronounced. It causes rapid highs, which threaten the heart. Then the crack leaves the user with an extreme low, which demands an instant "fix."

Other drugs, such as PCP, heroin and the whole class of designer drugs may be even more harmful.

Our second goal must be a complete and lasting change in social attitudes toward drug use. Drug use must become and remain completely and utterly unacceptable in American life.

This will require more than our disgust. The elimination of drug use requires our radical rejection of any form of acceptability. We must let our kids know with certainty that we do not approve of drug use and that we expect them to abstain.

Third, we must mobilize community treatment and prevention efforts to deal with the user and the potential user. Treatment and prevention will go a long way in removing the problem of drug use in America.

For example, hard-core addicts use over 90 percent of the heroin in this country. Addicted cocaine users account for over 50 percent of the cocaine use.

These people need expensive treatment which will take them off the streets, and thereby reduce a large amount of the demand for these two drugs. If we remove these users from the marketplace, then the market itself will be seriously undermined.

For a lower cost we can educate, and with minimal encouragement and counseling remove, users of drugs who are less heavily involved but greater in numbers. These users are particularly important because they are following the same path as the seriously addicted. New users are led to experiment by those around them in a normal setting—their school mates, fellow workers and social acquaintances—who show no ill effects from drug use, at least in the beginning.

We must reach these new users with the message that drug use is often a one-way street. So the onus is ultimately on us. The President has made it very clear that each of us must take a clear-cut, personal stand against drug use. I urge the readers of the *Times* to do just that, and help us reach the three goals I have outlined.

THE NONSERIOUS DRUG CONTROL OPTION

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering serious and far-reaching antidrug legislation designed to combat the insidious threats of drug use and drug addiction with drug education and rehabilitation programs, more aggressive enforcement of antidrug laws, and improved interdiction activities at our Nation's borders. There are, however, proposals in other branches of the Government to address drug abuse on the Nation's streets and among its youth by asking middle-aged Washington bureaucrats to take urinalysis tests. The following article from yesterday's Washington Post demonstrates that such an approach not only diverts attention from serious antidrug efforts, but is also based on extremely faulty scientific procedures.

In light of information such as this, I can only say that I am very relieved that Congress is taking a serious and comprehensive approach to the problem of drug abuse.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 10, 1986]

DRUG TESTING OPEN TO MISUSE AND FALSE READINGS

(By Phillip J. Hilts)

Drug testing is a tricky, technical business that under ideal circumstances can accurately identify more than half of those who have used drugs, while falsely accusing a tiny percentage.

But in practice, testing like that in use at many companies is subject to so many hazards and serious questions of misuse that it would be virtually impossible to set up a program free from significant human error and potential for fraud, according to experts.

Drug testing is being considered by the Reagan administration for a wide range of federal employees.

Experts say the greatest abuse of the technology comes in business, and that as the tests become more widespread, the toll in mistakes and false accusations may be large. "I just hope there isn't too high a body count" before testing is done properly, said Theodore Shults, corporate lawyer for CompuChem, a drug-testing firm in Research Triangle Park, N.C.

By consensus, the best testing programs—and the system used by the military—first employ a screening test using a rough method, followed by an expensive and far more accurate second test. The first test misses a substantial number of people, perhaps as many as half, who have signs of drug use in their systems. It also falsely finds drug indicators in urine 5 percent of the time at a minimum, possibly more frequently.

Because of the high inaccuracy rate of these initial tests, the second is used to check results showing drugs present. This second test, experts say, is critical to any testing system but frequently is not used by businesses.

The typical sort of testing expected in a large screening program, like that being considered for federal employees, involves taking a urine sample and testing it for two to eight drugs. Some drugs can be identified for a few days after they have been taken,

such as cocaine, and others for months, such as marijuana.

Factors affecting the accuracy of the final result include whether the sample was taken correctly with a witness present; whether the person tested has eaten or drunk something that will confound the test; the type of test used to take a first look for drugs; the type of test used to confirm the first result, and sloppiness such as mislabeling or contamination of the sample at any stage of the process.

The hazards of testing begin before the urine sample is taken. Subjects may be taking prescription or nonprescription drugs that can falsely give positive readings on the initial test. In addition, the amount of liquid taken before a test can affect the result.

Drugs that can cause false positives in screening for marijuana use, for example, are anti-inflammatory drugs and such common painkillers as Advil and Nuprin. In testing for amphetamines drugs that can give false positives include diet pills, nasal decongestants and heart or asthma medication.

Accuracy also requires a clear "chain of custody" of the urine sample, witnessed at every step to prevent switching, adulterating or mislabeling.

Thus, in the strictest programs, test subjects must be closely observed while they urinate into sample bottles.

When samples are taken to the laboratory, two screening tests are most common: the radio immunoassay (RIA), and the enzyme-multiplied immunoassay technique (EMIT).

Both use methods in which special chemicals from the body's immune system, called antibodies, pick out drugs or drug-breakdown products if they are present in the urine.

Both methods are also relatively inaccurate. In a study by the federal Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, 13 drug-testing firms were sent urine samples not knowing they were from the CDC. The study showed that results varied from zero correct to 100 percent correct in identifying drugs such as cocaine morphine and barbiturates. Most firms were correct less than half the time.

In contrast, Cmdr. Walter Vogl, a senior policy analyst in the office of the assistant defense secretary for health affairs, said that in military testing of about 3 million people annually, the first screening tests are correct about 90 percent of the time.

Experts agree that the most important drug test is the second, confirmatory test. This must be done with a gas chromatograph mass spectrometer test, according to D. Ian MacDonald, director of the federal Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration.

While screening tests cost a few dollars a sample, this second test can cost as much as \$100. Its accuracy, however, is counted by experts to be near 100 percent, not counting human errors such as mislabeling.

THE RIGHT BOOKS

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the accompany-

ing article, written by Chilton Williamson, Jr., that recently appeared in the National Review. This article addresses the issue of amnesty as contained in H.R. 3810, the Immigration Control and Legalization Amendments Act of 1986, and highlights the studies of Donald L. Huddle, professor of economics at Rice University, as they pertain to the effect of amnesty on the United States, economically, culturally, and demographically.

This article was brought to my attention by "Americans for Immigration Control" and I would like to recognize them for the significant contribution they have made to the entire debate on immigration policy.

I urge my colleagues to consider the implications of the amnesty provisions contained in H.R. 3810 and to reject them when the bill comes to the floor for consideration.

[From the National Review, Aug. 29, 1986]

THE RIGHT BOOKS

(By Chilton Williamson, Jr.)

Some time during the next couple of months, Congress is scheduled to consider a crucial set of reforms: those concerning the nation's immigration policies. Although the various bills that have been proposed over the last three Congresses differ in a number of significant ways, one thing they have in common is an amnesty provision. Simpson-Mazzoli offers amnesty to illegals who have been in the United States since before January 1, 1980; the Rodino and Roybal versions move up the cutoff date of January 1, 1982; while some legislators wish for the still more generous deadline of New Year's Day, 1984.

There are plenty of voices raised in both chambers denying the virtue and wisdom of amnesty altogether, but so far their successes have been of a negative variety: They have been able to kill legislation so pernicious in its likely effect as to be worse than no legislation at all. For the past three years this attitude toward the question of amnesty has been derided as mulish, quixotic, or troglodytic; but it is precisely the question upon which new studies by Donald L. Huddle, Professor of Economics at Rice University, direct a laser-like beam, suggesting that the amnesty concept represents an enormous threat to the United States, economically, culturally, and demographically.

The first of these "discussions"—"Amnesty Implications of the 1985 Houston Survey" (available upon request and at cost from the Department of Economics, Rice University, P.O. Box 1982, Houston, Tex. 77251)—concerns the findings of a field survey of undocumented workers in the Houston metropolitan area undertaken in 1985 by Professor Huddle. Taking for their study a sample of two hundred undocumented workers from five Latin American countries, Huddle and his Rice University research team approached with the question: How would you respond to an amnesty program such as that proposed by the current immigration-reform bills?

Although, before Huddle's, there were virtually no empirical studies seeking to assess the possible impact of any particular legalization measure, certain assumptions had been widely and uncritically accepted in quarters where people are paid to consider such matters. One such assumption (fervently propagated by the Mexican government) is that the majority of illegals reside only temporarily in the United States before slipping back to their homes south of

the Rio Grande. That may have been more or less true until the 1960s, but since then the pattern has altered considerably: 89 per cent of Huddle's interviewees claimed they hoped to enjoy permanent-resident status in the U.S., while 61 per cent wanted citizen status. Another assumption concerns the number of illegals who would accept legalization: One analyst, after a study of the ill-fated Canadian amnesty of a decade ago, suggested a likely figure of one in three, while pro-amnesty groups have argued that an even lower figure is probable. However, of Huddle's sample, 85 per cent said they would apply for legalization under amnesty. Huddle's figures show that, on average, these newly legalized residents would each expect to bring two immediate relatives into the country, for starters.

Now, the number of illegals currently in the United States is a matter of debate, with estimates running between four and 12 million (Huddle himself places the illegal population at around nine million). Depending upon which estimate you select and which amnesty cutoff date you choose, by using a multiplier of two, you come out with estimates ranging from 1.9 to 12.5 million bodies added to the U.S. population by a stroke of the pen; while, with a multiplier of four ("the Immigration Service figures conservatively that a legalized Third World adult alien, will, on average, seek four additional visas for immediate and extended family members, and more in the future as chain migration takes effect"), the numbers increase to between four and 25 million. Now, 25 million people is nearly a third the population of Mexico; which makes you wonder why, if we are going to offer legalization on that scale, the legislation that accomplishes it should bother itself with such futilities as employer sanctions and beefing up the Border Patrol.

Huddle has argued elsewhere the displacement effects of illegal aliens on the native labor market, as well as the falsity of the myth that illegals contribute to the economy more than they subtract from its cornucopia of welfare benefits. He recapitulates and extends those arguments in this and in another discussion paper, "A Profile of Illegal Immigrants in the Houston Metroplex: Implications for Amnesty, Employer Sanctions, and U.S. Immigration Policy." His studies deserve to be taken seriously by every congressman, and his conclusion—that a broad amnesty program with a recent cutoff date will create a "Third World backlog population pressing to get into the United States by any means possible," the result being that "Congress would soon again face the same pressing questions of civil and amnesty rights for the undocumented masses"—needs to be deeply pondered.

THE SPACE STATION AND MICROMANAGEMENT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my reservations about action that is expected tomorrow on the Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies Appropriations bill, H.R. 5313, pertaining to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA] budget within that bill. I

am concerned that my colleague, Mr. EDWARD BOLAND, chairman of the HUD-IND Appropriations Subcommittee, whom I deeply respect, will be offering an amendment that will further tighten the restraining straps that the Appropriations Committee has already placed on NASA's Space Station Program.

According to the Democratic Study Group, the Boland amendment is designed "to limit funding under NASA's research and development account to \$160 million for development of the space station and to specify that funds for such space station development shall not be available for obligation prior to enactment of a subsequent appropriations act authorizing the obligation of such funds." The way I understand this amendment, it would keep NASA from moving into the development phase, or phase C/D, of the Space Station Program without first getting a supplemental bill passed in the Appropriations Committee and signed into a law.

While the Boland amendment in itself is not overwhelming or dramatic, it does highlight the continuing trend of the Appropriations Committees usurping the responsibilities of the authorizing committees. I believe that the Boland amendment is uncalled for because there is already sufficient—indeed more than sufficient—restrictive language in the HUD-Independent Agencies bill to keep NASA from moving into the phase C/D of station development without requiring a supplemental appropriation. The bill clearly states.

"Release of the balance of \$150,000,000 . . . will not be approved by the Committees on Appropriations until selected requirements are satisfied—and a plan . . . for the implementation of such requirements is approved by the committees."

To tighten the screws on NASA even further with the Boland amendment could be detrimental to the program.

I commend Chairman BOLAND and the HUD-IND Appropriations Subcommittee for its intense and thorough oversight of the NASA budget. But micromanaging the specific program elements to achieve the committee-perceived objectives could be considered an abuse of power.

The committee report places a set of four requirements on the space station planners in order to ensure that "approximately 80 per cent of the benefits of the station shall be derived by the United States," and that the station "will produce useful results at the outset of station activity." First, I would challenge the committee to quantify the benefits that we can expect to gain from the station. How do you measure the infinite number of possible benefits that may emerge from the space station activities, which will essentially be a laboratory in space, and then attempt to divide the benefits up among the international participants? Indeed, if we embrace the committee's recommendations, our foreign partners will be given a cold reception in a project to which they have already committed themselves.

As for ensuring that the station produces useful results at an early date, I would argue that the useful results of the space station will be evident on the first deployment mission. No one has ever tried to build a structure the size of a football field in space before. I think my colleagues on the Appropriations Commit-

tee sometimes forget that the space station is not an end in itself, but rather it is a single element in a larger and greater infrastructure yet to be built in space. Frankly, I am concerned that in the rush to deploy, we may miss some valuable opportunities to experiment with different construction techniques. To place deployment requirements on a program that is still evolving could seriously impede the effective execution of the President's 1984 space station directive.

Unfortunately, momentum is on the side of the HUD-IND appropriations bill, and it will likely pass with the space station provisions still in place. I will, however, oppose any amendment to further construct or undermine the space station program or any other part of the NASA budget. I encourage my colleagues to join me in this opposition.

CHEYNEY UNIVERSITY

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to pay tribute today in the House of Representatives to one of the premier institutions of higher education in the United States.

Cheyney University, Mr. Speaker, will celebrate the 150th anniversary of its founding on Saturday, September 20, 1986.

Since its establishment on a 275-acre campus just outside Philadelphia in Delaware County, Cheyney has opened the doors of knowledge and opportunity to thousands of black young men and women. Its gifted and dedicated faculty members have prepared their students for careers in the sciences, arts, and professions, and have established a reputation for Cheyney as one of our Nation's most prestigious black institutions of higher education.

Steering Cheyney University through one of its most important periods, Mr. Speaker, was Dr. Wade Wilson, who served as president from 1968 through 1981. Now Cheyney's president emeritus, Dr. Wilson is one of America's foremost educators. He is a distinguished humanitarian who has represented our Nation in numerous international education conferences, and who has earned a deserved reputation as a person with unselfish commitment to community service and the well-being of students at his alma mater, Cheyney University.

On September 20, Mr. Speaker, the Cheyney University Historical Commission will honor Dr. Wilson at a reception celebrating Cheyney's 150th anniversary.

I know that my colleagues will join me, Mr. Speaker, in saluting this outstanding institution and the man who has played such a pivotal role in its growth.

SANDINISTA REGIME CHARGED WITH ARRESTS OF OPPOSITION LEADERS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, repression and persecution continue in Nicaragua. The Sandinista regime arbitrarily arrests and detains opposition leaders who differ in their views from the government. The latest incident occurred last week when Bayardo Guzman, one of the national vice presidents of the Independent Liberal Party (PLI), was arrested. According to PLI President Virgilio Godoy, approximately 100 PLI members and intermediate leaders are being held in Nicaragua. A report of the arrest of Guzman follows:

MANAGUA, 4 Sep (ACAN-EFE).—A leader of the opposition Independent Liberal Party [PLI] was arrested by the Sandinist police and taken to an undisclosed location, the PLI reported today.

The detainee is Bayardo Guzman Martinez, the third national vice president of the PLI, the second force in the parliamentary opposition. Top PLI leader Virgilio Godoy said that "seven state security agents violently kidnapped Guzman from his own home (in the eastern city of Masaya), and took him to an unknown location."

Guzman Martinez's detention took place yesterday morning, the source said.

The incident "constitutes a gross reprisal against the PLI because of the efforts it has been making along with other parties in favor of the national dialogue," Godoy said. The liberal leader pointed out that approximately 100 PLI members and intermediate leaders "are being held at various prisons" throughout the country.

Godoy insisted that these incidents demonstrate "the governing party's lack of political willingness to seek peaceful solutions for the acute crisis affecting Nicaragua."

Godoy demanded the "immediate release" of the PLI leader, and an "end to the persecution of PLI members, whose only crime is civil disagreement with the policies and conduct of the FSLN and its government."

"We do not know where Guzman Martinez is, or what he is accused of. The case is very mysterious," the PLI national president told ACAN-EFE.

TRIBUTE TO YUE-SAI KAN

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, since February an audience of 300 million in the People's Republic of China has had the opportunity to watch a remarkably weekly television series produced and hosted by Yue-Sai Kan, an American citizen who was born in China.

Twice a week, Ms. Kan hosts her program, "One World," for the single largest television audience in the world. The 52-week series provides the Chinese audience with a view of the world since the program schedule includes scenes from more than 20 countries in

Europe, Africa, Australia, and North and South America.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Kan has become a household word in China and as a de facto "citizen-ambassador" she has fostered a great deal of good will and understanding between our Nation and China. She also produces and hosts a program devoted to Asia, known as "Looking East," which airs on cable and UHF channels in 48 States.

Ms. Kan's "One World" is a historic endeavor because she is the first foreigner to ever produce and host a television program on Chinese television. Her program, which has received high praise for its sensitivity and superb quality, will help to develop media and television programming in China. Her program is more than entertainment, it also is used as an educational tool by teachers who tape the program for classroom use.

"One World" provides the Chinese viewers with scenes of a world they seldom see, while "Looking East" provides American viewers with a fresh perspective on Asia. All in all, the programming produced by Ms. Kan satisfies a curiosity that exists in both East and West about each others' cultures. Ms. Kan is providing East and West with a global perspective.

Ms. Kan, who was born in China and raised in Hong Kong before coming to the United States, where she attended Brigham Young University and the University of Hawaii before embarking on her television career.

Her efforts have won her the title of "a modern day Marcia Polo" from Money magazine, while the New York Times said her work augurs well not only for China and America, but for the rest of the world, as well.

Ms. Kan, whose father, Kan Wing-Lin, is one of best known Chinese painters, provides the people of China with a unique window to the world. She has succeeded in spanning the divide between two different cultures. She is a credit to her heritage and her citizenship.

AMENDING INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949. This bill provides that the value of claims determined by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission be based on the fair market value of the property taken.

This bill was considered by the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade on Thursday, September 11, 1986, and H.R. 5365, where technical amendments were offered. Therefore, the bill now encompasses those amendments considered by the subcommittee, and is being reintroduced.

In the past, legislation concerning the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has not contained an explicit reference to the compensation standard required by international law, with the exception of the Cuban Claims Act of 1964. Without the definition of a com-

pensation standard, the potential for claims decisions inconsistent with international law exists, which could harm current and future U.S. investment abroad. This bill remedies that situation.

The purpose of this legislation, which is entirely prospective, is to specify that fair market value may include, but not be limited to, the market value of outstanding securities, replacement value, going-concern value, and book value. It establishes a presumption that in the case of service industries, the appropriate basis for determining fair market value is going-concern value. This presumption is not mandatory, nor does it limit the discretion of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in any way.

Growth in the service industries is vital to the economy of the United States, and this includes the ability of those industries to expand overseas. It is important to not only protect business interests abroad which are owned by U.S. nationals, but also to ensure that if their property is nationalized or otherwise taken by a foreign government, the value of their claims for such losses will be determined fairly.

THE 1986 CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. JIM ROSS LIGHTFOOT

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, today I want to bring to your attention an issue about which we should all be concerned. That is, the plight of the Soviet Jews. The want and need to be with one's family and to be able to practice religious and moral convictions seems to be a reasonable exercise of one's basic human rights, unless you are a citizen of the Soviet Union—particularly a Jewish citizen of the Soviet Union.

Massive emigration from the Soviet Union began in 1975 after the signing of the Helsinki accords. In 1979, the number of people emigrating from the Soviet Union gradually rose to 50,000, which was to be its all time maximum. Since then the number has diminished to a trickle, even though the number of people requesting visas remains high. The Jews in the Soviet Union are persecuted, harassed, have their jobs terminated, and some are even tortured for requesting a visa. All Jews connected with the state in any manner are considered dangerous because they may know classified information and therefore are denied visas. In all actuality, classified information may be the simple knowledge of the way life really is in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Jews' situation grows worse every day, but we can make a difference. I have cosigned numerous letters to the Soviet Union pleading for basic human rights that most of us take for granted. This type of effort has proven to be effective in helping an individual emigrate—sometimes it even saves lives—because the Soviet Government is reluctant to continue with cases of repression once they become the subject of widespread public attention. It is very important that we

continue with all efforts to help these struggling people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge all of my colleagues to join the Soviet Jews in their struggle for basic human rights. We need to make it known to the Soviet Union that we will not simply turn our heads on these atrocities.

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES HONORED

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, once again I take great pleasure in rising in support of the passage of House Joint Resolution 653 which designates the week of September 15, as "National Historically Black Colleges Week." I feel that such a week of recognition is but a small tribute to the important and prominent contributions that these institutions have made to our society.

Presently, there are 99 historically black colleges and universities in the United States. Those of you who are familiar with the rich heritage of these institutions know that they grant more than 30,000 degrees each year in every field of study. History attests to the fact that numerous prominent scholars, educators, businessmen, and professionals were graduates of one or another of these fine schools, and I am pleased that we are able to show our support and thanks for the goals and accomplishments of these institutions.

Through passage of this resolution, I am pleased that we are able for the fourth year to express our respect and gratitude for the prominent roles that historically black colleges and universities have played, and continue to play in our society.

ST. CAMILLUS ACADEMY—AN EXAMPLE FOR AMERICAN SCHOOLS EVERYWHERE

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district has received national attention in recent years over its comparatively low academic standing and number of high school graduates. We are now actively working on a program to reverse that trend and improve our schools.

So it gives me great pleasure to report to you that in my district, there is a small high school which has the highest percentage of National Merit Scholarship semifinalists in Kentucky, and maybe the highest in the entire Nation.

St. Camillus Academy in Corbin, KY has a graduating class of only 19 students this year, yet the school has unbelievably had six of its current students and one former student achieve semifinalist status on this year's exams.

Led by Principal Sister Mary Amabilis Martineau, this school has created an outstanding

academic atmosphere for its students. Its emphasis on academics, discipline, and hard work are clearly evident in the results of the merit scholarship exams this year.

Those six students who made National Merit Scholarship semifinalist are: Patrick Hayden, Michael Davis, Robert Jarrell, Amy Jackson, Robert Messer, and Sherry Shaffer. Another student, Denise Brantigan, attended St. Camillus until this year, when she transferred to Laurel County High School.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this accomplishment deserves our support and our commendations. At a time when schools throughout the Nation are putting new emphasis on quality in education, St. Camillus is showing that good, old-fashioned hard work, and parental support make a difference in our children's education.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in congratulating these young men and women, and the faculty and staff of St. Camillus, for this truly outstanding achievement. Their accomplishments offer all our schools an excellent example of the kind of quality education which we must strive for.

A TRIBUTE TO ARTHUR M. LAWRENCE

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to salute Arthur M. Lawrence, an outstanding leader in the health care community who this month retires after 33 years of service to the people of western Pennsylvania.

I have been privileged to know Art Lawrence for nearly 10 years. During this time, Art has been the link to government for Blue Cross of western Pennsylvania, serving as that organization's senior vice president for community and government affairs. He has been a strong, articulate, and sensitive advocate for Blue Cross and the millions of citizens it serves. We will miss him tremendously.

Art is a unique individual who combines a strong background and experience in media and public relations with a genuine sense of caring for people. His personal interest in the special needs of the unemployed, financially disadvantaged, and the elderly have led to innovative programs of health insurance coverage for these groups in western Pennsylvania. And his personal community service as a member of the board of directors of such groups as the Health Systems Agency, the Nursing Foundation, and the Western Pennsylvania Caring Foundation attests to his dedication to people.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to salute Art Lawrence. Many know him as a good friend and a generous and unselfish leader in the health care field. With hopes that we in Pittsburgh will continue to have his counsel on issues important to the health of people in our region, we wish Art the very best in his retirement.

A GLOBAL SUMMIT ON TERRORISM IS NOW IMPERATIVE

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a resolution (H. Res. 547), cosponsored by the leadership and members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, calling on the President to convene a world summit to decide on effective, united means to combat international terrorism.

In the past weeks the world has been shocked by a tremendous upsurge in international terrorism, after a respite of some months following America's action against Libya. The hijacking of Pan Am Flight 73 in which 3 Americans and 17 others were killed, and the massacre at the Neve Shalom synagogue in Istanbul, in which 21 Jews were killed at prayer are just the most prominent examples. There have also been attacks in Western Europe, and another American, Frank Reed, was kidnapped in Beirut.

The administration has been reacting properly in response to these outrages. We have sent a most persuasive emissary, Ambassador to the United Nations Vernon Walter, to Europe in an attempt to rally support for additional pressure against Libya, but the reaction to our request was disappointing. The Congress has recently called on the President to work for the establishment of an international coordinating committee on terrorism.

The continuing failure of our most strenuous efforts to establish a unified, effective international policy on terrorism is an indication that there are differences which need to be addressed at the highest level. Accordingly, we are calling on the President to convene a summit meeting on terrorism to achieve that kind of coordination and effective policy.

The agenda for such a meeting should include taking steps to end the misuse of diplomatic facilities, such as pouches and embassies, in support of terrorism; expelling diplomats representing states supporting terrorism; applying economic sanctions against countries harboring or training terrorists; establishing standards for better airport and seaport security; establishing terms for the exchange of information on terrorist activities; providing stricter visa and immigration requirements for nationals of states supporting terrorism; and, finally, agreeing upon mechanisms for coordination and cooperation in the use of force, when necessary and appropriate, against terrorist targets.

At the close of the Second World War, the democracies of the West united in a defensive alliance against threatened aggression. Responsible leaders of the world must now come together and decide to fight this new aggression—the menace of international terrorism which threatens to engulf us all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all my colleagues join us in cosponsoring this resolution, and I ask that a list of the original cosponsors and the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point:

H. RES. 547

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should convene a summit meeting of world leaders to adopt a unified, effective program against international terrorism

Whereas international terrorism respects no borders, is a scourge on societies throughout the world, and has wreaked havoc on the lives of countless innocent persons;

Whereas since January 1, 1980, international terrorism has resulted in the deaths of over 3050 persons (including 345 Americans);

Whereas terrorism is never justified as a means to reach any political end;

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly has, by unanimous vote, condemned the use of terrorism for any purpose whatever;

Whereas world religious, government, and social leaders have condemned the senseless, barbaric loss of life caused by terrorists;

Whereas the Congress has passed and the President has signed into law Public Law 99-399, the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986, which directs the President to continue to seek the establishment of an International Antiterrorism Committee; and

Whereas there is an urgent need for responsible world leaders to formulate a comprehensive international strategy to combat terrorism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should convene a summit meeting of world leaders to adopt a unified, effective program against international terrorism.

FULL LIST OF COSPONSORS

Representatives Gilman, Farnell, Broomfield, Hamilton, Yatron, Solarz, Mica, Barnes, Wolpe, Crockett, Gejdenson, Dymally, Lantos, Smith (FL), Reid, Levine, Weiss, Udall, Garcia, Lagomarsino, Leach, Roth, Snowe, Hyde, Solomon, Bereuter, Siljander, Zschau, Dornan, Smith (NJ), Mack, DeWine, and McCain.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, the late H.L. Mencken once observed:

There is no record in history of a nation that ever gained anything valuable by being unprepared to defend itself.

This basic tenet is embodied in our Constitution. However, the role Congress has forged for itself in crafting our Nation's defense over the past 25 years, and in particular since the end of the Vietnam war, has grown out of proportion to the intent of our Founding Fathers and to the detriment of all rules of efficient management.

There is something terribly wrong with the budget process when Congress determines that the only way that it can get a handle on runaway Federal spending is through the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Deficit Reduction Act. The necessity of this measure rested on the fact that Congress has failed to approve a

single Reagan administration budget, and has yet to meet the deadlines set for itself, in law, under the 1974 Budget Act. So rather than make the hard decisions themselves, or acquiesce to the President's program, we chose to take the coward's way out.

One disastrous result was U.S. defense spending declined 6.3 percent from the previous year. Since the end of the Vietnam war, there has only been two other years, fiscal year 1978 and 1979 that saw declines in defense budget authority—1.6 percent and 0.02 percent respectively. The major upheaval in defense programs, forced cuts, reprogramming, and so forth, plays havoc with defense management.

I cannot accept the liberal bias that defense is the simple equal of any and all other Government programs. Nor, given the increases in domestic spending since 1970, can I accept that defense expenditures must bear the brunt of the cost of reducing the budget.

Instead of focusing on broad military policy and spending guidelines, Congress has become ever more involved in micromanagement. Liberal Members and staff seem anxious to control every detail of our national security programs. With the passage of this year's Defense authorization bill, this control has now broadened to directing the United States arms control policies.

But the micromanagement of defense, twice a year, has done nothing to improve defense management. In many respects this is detrimental to efficiency. The congressional budgeting process prompts the services to protect marginal programs that should be killed and discourages effective testing that would indicate where weakness lies.

Furthermore, in the last 10 years we have had our defense appropriations signed into law only twice before the fiscal year began. In other years, DOD has operated under continuing resolutions at prior year spending levels. This is not sound management.

Outside of major changes in the congressional budget process, the detrimental micromanagement of the Defense Department will continue. However, there is a potential solution that would go a long way to mitigate a legislative process that by nature inspires micromanagement. Congress must be convinced that effective reforms must include change in the budget process. I am a strong advocate of a 2-year defense budget coupled with multi-year procurement.

The 2-year budget has a number of attractive arguments in its favor. It would begin to lengthen the current short-term focus in Congress that often crowds out meaningful program review and evaluation. It would provide better, more effective oversight of the Pentagon by reducing time spent on program-related details. It would help cut down on friction between the executive and legislative branches and potentially serve to facilitate better coordination and cooperation. It would provide more specific and timely authorization guidance to Congress. And, it would lower weapon unit costs by providing stability in the defense procurement process. Multiyear procurement with congressional oversight at principal milestones will provide stability, encourage efficiency and allow for proper development and testing. These management tools

will go a long way to prevent the pennywise/pound foolish defense thinking that put us in the deficit acquisition quagmire we are in today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the record an article that appeared in Defense News on September 8, 1986. The author, Andrew K. Ellis, elaborates on the point that there is something wrong with the process when the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee, and the chairman and ranking Senator of the Senate Armed Services Committee cannot support the final Defense authorization bill as passed by the House of Representatives. I strongly urge my colleagues to read the following poignant analysis.

DEFENSE BILL PLAYS POLITICS IN HOUSE—NATIONAL SECURITY NEEDS OBJECTIVITY, NOT POLITICALLY MOTIVATED BLOCS

(By Andrew K. Ellis)

If Mikhail Gorbachev had been true to his word, the one-year Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing would have expired on Aug. 6—the 41st anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. The general secretary hesitated, however, because a far more meaningful propaganda victory was pending, courtesy of the Democratic-controlled House of Representatives. Gorbachev's patience did not go unrewarded as unilateral arms controllers in the House stole the show during floor consideration of the 1987 defense bill. Perhaps rendered speechless by his good fortune, Gorbachev did not get around to extending his one-year, 12-day moratorium until recently.

While Gorbachev's test-ban posturing comes as no surprise, the swift and stunning imposition of the liberal Democratic agenda on the 1987 defense authorization bill does. Many Democrats will respond, however, that the arms control votes during consideration of the defense bill were bipartisan, as a number of House Republicans jumped on the bandwagon. While there is a grain of truth to this, if one watched the arms control votes unfold on the floor, a solid bloc of Democratic votes was evident every time.

Unable to implement and even unwilling to introduce their arms control legislation in the more appropriate forum of the Armed Services Committee, House arms controllers descended on the authorization bill when it reached the floor. In one short week, the House: reduced Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) funding \$600 million from the already low committee level of \$3.4 billion; reversed the rational committee position on ASAT that would have allowed the U.S. test program to proceed as long as the Soviet ASAT system remained operational; imposed a moratorium on all nuclear testing below one kiloton (the worst of all worlds, as the kiloton limit explicitly recognizes the importance of testing while simultaneously being so low as to prove essentially meaningless from a scientific perspective); and forced the president to abide by the SALT II quantitative limits even though the treaty has never been ratified by the Senate and despite repeated Soviet violations of both its spirit and letter. As the crowning blow, and contrary to the recommendations of both the Joint Budget Resolution and the House Armed Services Committees, the full House cut an additional \$5.5 billion from the overall defense budget—although a 3 percent military pay raise was retained for obvious political reasons.

Something has gone very wrong with the entire process when the final bill cannot be supported by the committee's ranking Republican, when the ranking Democrat on the Senate Armed Services Committee accuses the House of having gone "too far," and when the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee is allegedly considering not conferring the two authorization bills. When the authorizers of our national security willingly abdicate their responsibilities to the appropriators, the system has broken down.

House Armed Services Chairman Les Aspin argues that the recent success of these arms control incentives in the House can be interpreted as a vote of no confidence in the president's arms control policies. Since his own Armed Services Committee would have rejected any of these initiatives out of hand (and did in the case of SDI and ASAT), perhaps the success of the arms controllers on the floor should be construed as reflecting Aspin's as well as the liberal Democrat's inability to develop and maintain a policy consensus within the committee. The point, however, is that the House committee tasked with defense authorization apparently believed, and right so, that the inclusion in its bill of sweeping arms control concessions to the Soviet Union was neither proper or prudent. Unfortunately, the full House was far less cautious.

Finally, it is a statement made just prior to the bill's final passage by Les AuCoin (D-Ore.), the quintessential liberal arms controller, that deserves scrutiny and clarification. In urging Republicans to support the amended defense bill, AuCoin stated, "I can understand how many members on the Republican side feel right now, because you have lost on a fair-play basis . . ." Surely AuCoin was temporarily overwhelmed by his arms control-induced euphoria and consequently misspoke. To consciously call "fair" the inflexible mechanism that emerged out of the Rules Committee to structure the floor debate on the defense bill is beyond comprehension.

If they were truly fair, the Democrats should at least be willing to call a spade a spade. They controlled the debate from the outset and rigged the rules in such a way as to predetermine the outcome. For evidence, one has only to read HR531, the "rule" for floor consideration of the defense bill. The Democrats structured the debate in such a way as to restrict consideration of a number of "special topic" issues, prohibit perfecting legislation (i.e. compromise), and render the Armed Services Committee's position on a number of issues unattainable. While the bill in its amended form may offend the sensibilities of many Americans, it certainly cannot be regarded as a surprise under the carefully manipulated circumstances.

AuCoin's interpretation of "fairness" raises a more important point. Arms control—and for that matter all issues of national security—should have nothing to do with fairness. Fairness is a subjective term and by definition an analysis of reality. National security policy is too important to be forged by the random whims of temporary, politically motivated alliances—it demands objectivity and consistency.

Gorbachev waited 12 days after his moratorium was to have expired to react because House action on the defense bill held great promise for the Kremlin, something they did not wish to jeopardize with a premature propaganda campaign. The House fulfilled the general secretary's wildest dreams and then some. These are objective facts that

must not be lost in all the excited liberal rhetoric. Reality still confronts us each and every day and should therefore demand of our elected officials a coherent international posture. Hopefully such an approach to the world around us will not elude the House of Representatives for too much longer.

REPRESENTATIVE DIOGUARDI CALLS FOR REFORMS OF THE FEDERAL FINANCIAL SYSTEM

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, as one of a handful of certified public accountants in our Congress, our colleague Representative JOE DIOGUARDI of New York is preeminently qualified to discuss the reform of our budget and financial process. In the following article, he persuasively argues that the Federal Government's financial, management, budget, and accounting systems are a national disgrace.

Representative DIOGUARDI is not alone. The General Accounting Office Director Frederick D. Wolf has also argued for a revamping of the budget process, strengthened Federal accounting, auditing, and reporting systems, and improved and strengthened internal controls. White House Chief of Staff Don Regan also recently called for major policy initiatives to reform the Federal financial system.

As a beginning remedy to our chaotic and haphazard accounting procedures, Representative DIOGUARDI has introduced H.R. 4495. The bill would establish a new Office of Chief Financial Officer [CFO] to direct and coordinate Federal financial management. The bill also would establish an assistant secretary for financial management in each executive department; and a comptroller in each executive agency. In general, the CFO would provide leadership and direction while monitoring executive agencies in their financial management and reporting activities. As a cosponsor of this bill, I can fully endorse those goals.

In the following article, Representative DIOGUARDI discusses some very important reforms to put the Federal Government on a more businesslike footing. For example, he raises the idea of a Federal capital budget. The Federal Government's capital expenditures—for items like roads and bridges—run over \$100 billion yearly. Yet under current accounting procedures, these costs are written off in a lump sum at the beginning, rather than over a period of years. At least 37 States now have a separate capital budget. It's time the Federal Government improve its own financial accounting system by considering this idea.

Representative DIOGUARDI also raises the issue of removing trust funds from the unified budget. Social Security, highway, and some other programs are financed by their own earmarked taxes. Yet under current procedures, they are commingled with generally financed programs. Proper accounting procedures should be developed for trust funds as well as long-term costs and obligations of the Federal Government.

The line-item veto is another important budget reform that should be passed by Congress. The administration has asked repeatedly for the authority to veto individual appropriation line items in the budget, a power already enjoyed by many Governors. It could be an important new discipline for Federal spending.

In short, the current system is antiquated, unreliable, and indeed disgraceful. Our hodgepodge financial systems have resulted in wasteful spending, sloppy management, poor planning, and inaccurate reporting of the budget deficit.

I congratulate Representative DIOGUARDI for taking leadership on this priority issue, which I believe will be an important one in the year ahead. I commend the following article to my colleagues.

[From Management Accounting, August 1986]

CONGRESSMAN DIOGUARDI: "THE U.S. GOVERNMENT NEEDS A CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER"

(By Kathy Williams)

Will the United States government ever be run like a business—subject to proper accounting systems and procedures, a capital budget, audited financial statements, fiscal responsibility, adequate record keeping, good controls? Congressman Joseph J. DiGuardi (R-N.Y.), a former partner with Arthur Andersen & Co. and one of only four certified public accountants in Congress, is doing his best to make it happen.

Last March the freshman representative from New Rochelle in Westchester County introduced in the House of Representatives Bill H.R. 4495, the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act, calling for a chief financial officer for the federal government. Operating in much the same manner as a controller or CFO of a corporation, the federal CFO would coordinate all federal financial management activities by consolidating them within a single organization. At present, these activities are scattered across several areas: the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Office of Personnel Management (OPM), and the Treasury in the executive branch; the various executive branch agencies; and the General Accounting Office (GAO) in the legislative branch.

"None of these entities has clearcut responsibility for oversight and direction of the federal government's financial management operations and activities," Mr. DiGuardi notes. "In addition, financial management responsibilities have frequently been shifted from one central agency to another, and in each central agency, financial management functions must compete with a number of other assigned responsibilities for their fair share of attention. There is a missing link in the federal government. The linchpin of financial discipline is nowhere to be found. The financial management leadership void must be filled."

Mr. DiGuardi became determined to try to change the government's accounting systems after hearing "horror story after horror story regarding the lack of established businesslike financial management practices" during his first year on the Government Operations Committee and attending hearings on the deficit and government waste. The businessman of 22 years was appalled by the reactive attitude and actions of Congress, "robbing Peter to pay Paul, putting out fires every day, staying one step

ahead of the sheriff—that's our budgetary process."

"I thought I was going to Congress to get on the Board of Directors of Government," he exclaims. "Accountability is key to a Board of Directors, but I found we didn't have reliable financial information upon which to make decisions and report back to the public, our shareholders." He also discovered that the U.S. government operates on "a Mickey Mouse, cash basis of accounting and has no strategic planning whatsoever. The government is trained to think only a year ahead. It asks what we spent instead of how we spent it. It builds the home from the fifth floor down instead of the ground floor up. We have conditioned people in government to spend, not save," he admonishes.

He felt the time was right to introduce his legislation because of the current emphasis on reducing the federal deficit and curbing waste. A CFO could pull together previous attempts at coordinating government financial management practices. For example, the GAO for years has been reporting that "Our departments and agencies are a veritable jungle of special-purpose, incompatible, antiquated accounting systems producing unreliable, incompatible, and often irrelevant financial information. One of the latest GAO studies, moreover, reports that the federal government now uses 427 separate accounting systems, of which 53% do not conform to GAO accounting principles, standards, and related requirements," the congressman says.

The now-famous Grace Commission declared its "War on Waste" after uncovering in the government an estimated \$424 billion of mismanagement and projecting a \$1.96 trillion national deficit by the year 2000. J. Peter Grace, head of the Commission and chairman of W.R. Grace & Co., is, in fact, spending his own money to bring this message before the public via television commercials and print ads. The Citizens Against Government Waste, co-chaired by Mr. Grace and columnist Jack Anderson, is a nonprofit, bipartisan foundation formed to educate the public and Congress about the Grace Commission recommendations. The Grace Caucus, of which Mr. DioGuardi is an avid member, is a group of about 150 senators and representatives proselytizing to "not let the Grace Commission recommendations sit on the shelf."

Other predecessors to Bill H.R. 4495 include the Inspector General Act of 1978; the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982; Debt Collection Act of 1982; President Reagan's Council on Integrity and Efficiency; the President's Council on Management Improvement; a proposal by the Association of Government Accountants to strengthen controllership in the federal government; and various attempts by executive branch departments and agencies to reform their systems. These efforts aren't new—over the past 30-35 years, various systems and controls experts have developed coordinated accounting systems for the military and for other governmental operations, only to have them squelched right before actual implementation or implemented only partially. Even William E. Simon, former secretary of the treasury, 1974-77, tried to institute similar procedures in the Treasury function before he left office, but to no avail, and after he left, the matter dropped. Now Congressman Joe DioGuardi has picked up the gauntlet.

SETTING UP THE ORGANIZATION

The management structure Mr. DioGuardi envisions encompasses the CFO, who would serve in the executive office of the President; an assistant secretary for financial management in each executive department; and a controller in each executive agency. All would be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The CFO would serve a 10-year non-reappointable term, and the assistant secretaries and controllers would serve a four-year, reappointable term. A Federal Finance Council, consisting of the CFO and the assistant secretaries for financial management, also would be established to assist the CFO in formulating plans and objectives, comment on proposed major changes in financial management operations, and prepare recommendations on selected issues.

In general, the federal CFO would provide leadership and direction while monitoring executive agencies in their financial management and reporting activities. He would develop and maintain a five-year strategic plan that would cover "system enhancements, staffing needs, technology improvements, required legislative actions, financial management objectives, information requirements, and budget priorities," Mr. DioGuardi explains. The CFO also would create financial statements for the government, which would be subjected to audits, as well as maintain the government's central accounting and reporting records. He also would ensure that personnel were managing the financial operations properly—even down to the details of making sure cash and checks were deposited as soon as they came in, something that doesn't happen now. "He needs tentacles going into each governmental agency and operation if this thing is to work. Otherwise, he's going to be on Cloud Nine, talking about accounting principles and not knowing what's happening in the trenches," Mr. DioGuardi exclaims.

A natural candidate for the position, he muses, would be "someone from a major company—like ITT, Texaco, IBM—where you have to literally pull together all kinds of pieces of financial information from various divisions and industries and even holding companies. You need someone who has been in the trenches gathering information, managing the financial function—a CFO from the private sector, whether he or she is certified or not."

IS A CFO NECESSARY?

When criticized by other congressmen for concentrating too much on numbers and not enough on compassion, he instantly fires back that he is just as concerned as the next person about humanity, and cites other bills he has introduced—those on drug abuse, child abuse, suicide legislation, and homeless housing assistance. "I'm making qualitative judgments. I know there's a deficit problem, but I'm willing to increase some programs and decrease others based on how they are managed and what their needs are. Cutting right across the board to reduce the deficit is nonsense," he explodes. "We've got to exercise every bit of compassion to identify social needs, programs we need, and allocate resources. Once we allocate those resources, however, we must manage that program the way we'd manage any business. Let's make sure we hold people responsible. If they don't do their job, out! If they do their job, give them a bonus."

He reiterates his accounting background and speculates that if more members of Congress were attuned to business, they would better understand long-term ramifications

of their decisions. "We've counted 245 attorneys and only four accountants in Congress—at a time when we are trying to balance the books in government, dealing with budget issues, tax issues, economic issues. More than half of what we do relates to analysis, either quantitative or qualitative, that almost requires an accounting or business background . . . budget systems don't tie in with accounting systems. We have a budgetary system, an appropriation system, and continuing resolutions and supplementary budgets. I'm a CPA, and you can't imagine how difficult it is for me to follow what's going on. How other legislators are making these multi-billion dollar decisions, don't ask me. Then waste—waste isn't one big thing. Waste is thousands of small things. It's structural, it's systemic, and it must be approached from the point of view of systems and planning—a CFO's point of view. That's why I have to make this issue my crusade."

Joe DioGuardi isn't alone in his efforts to install a CFO in the federal government. "The idea first began to be proposed seriously in the early part of 1980 by leaders in financial management in both the public and private sectors," he notes. "Roland W. Burris, the comptroller of the state of Illinois, and Joseph E. Connor, chairman of Price Waterhouse & Co., have both assumed a key role in promoting the need for a CFO." Various other individuals, nonprofit organizations, and private sector groups are continuing this effort.

The General Accounting Office, charged with setting uniform accounting standards and principles for all federal agencies, is the government's independent auditor and a strong proponent for financial management reform. Comptroller General Charles A. Bowsher, head of the GAO, says, "We need better financial reporting at the federal level. It's the key to the whole issue. We have the auditor (the GAO) and we need a strong CFO function in the government—a scorekeeper for the executive branch. OMB is in charge of the budget, and the CFO would keep score of how the budgeted money is spent, so the two would work closely."

In a letter to a member of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, the counterpart to the House Government Operations Committee, Mr. Bowsher noted that "financial management in the federal government is a major problem facing us today. Poor systems, information inadequacies, and weak controls have frequently resulted in wasteful spending, inefficient management and losses totaling billions of dollars." He added, "... current financial reporting practices of the federal government do not disclose the actual cost of operations; do not disclose the financial condition of the federal government; do not disclose the current and probably future costs of investment or policy decisions; do not permit effective comparison of actual costs or accomplishments to budget plans; and do not provide the timely information required for efficient management of programs . . . there is no official with clearly defined authority and responsibility for assuring the effective and efficient operation of the federal government's accounting and other financial management systems. Clearly the original concept of tying management improvement to the budget just hasn't worked; the time has come to find a more workable solution to these problems. I believe the establishment of an independent Chief Financial Of-

ficer is a major element of such an approach."

AN EDITORIAL VIEWPOINT

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as Congress considers the troubling questions that have arisen since the tragic loss of the space shuttle, *Challenger*, the editor of the Omaha World Herald on September 2, 1986, produced a particularly insightful statement on the question of future spending for the Space Program. I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

BETTER OPTIONS ARE AVAILABLE THAN THROWING CASH AT NASA

Doubling the budget will not necessarily solve the problems the United States has with its space program. Spending twice as much is how the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics proposes to solve the problem, but the solution isn't that simple.

For one thing, the government doesn't have the money to double the \$7.5 billion-a-year budget of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

For another, the Challenger investigation has brought to light a number of questions about the agency's management procedures, as well as its mission and goals. These questions need to be answered before decisions are made about what level of financing will be necessary.

The country can't afford too much delay. Without the ability to replace its space satellites as they wear out, the country could eventually find itself at a severe disadvantage in the areas of communications, weather forecasting and military surveillance. The Soviet Union isn't the only competitor. Space programs also are emerging in Europe, Japan and China.

Last April, federal audits indicated that NASA and its contractors wasted billions of dollars on the shuttle and other space programs. The New York Times reported that the audits reflected "a far different picture from that widely held before the Challenger catastrophe of an essentially smoothly running, trouble-free agency."

A higher level of spending may become necessary to restore the nation's satellite-launching capability and pursue whatever other goals Congress and the White House set for NASA. The time to increase the spending, however, is when the goals have been set and NASA has demonstrated that it is able to pursue them efficiently.

ALABAMA WILDERNESS ACT OF 1986

HON. RONNIE G. FLIPPO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today the Alabama Wilderness Act of 1986.

In 1974 Congress enacted the Eastern Wilderness Act which designated 12,000 acres within the William F. Bankhead National

Forest in Alabama as the Sipsey Wilderness. The legislation I am introducing today would expand the Sipsey Wilderness by designating an additional 17,700 acres located adjacent to the Sipsey as wilderness. In addition this bill would designate the Sipsey River as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The Sipsey Wilderness and the proposed changes are located entirely in Lawrence County, AL which I am proud to represent in Congress.

This is not the first time I have introduced legislation to expand the Sipsey Wilderness. I first introduced a bill to expand the Sipsey Wilderness in the 97th Congress in 1982. This bill proposed adding approximately 29,000 to the Sipsey. The House passed this bill on August 4, 1982 by a vote of 254 to 49. I re-introduced similar legislation in the 98th Congress. Again the House passed this bill on June 6, 1983 by voice vote with no dissent heard.

The bills approved by the House in 1982 and 1983 enjoyed widespread support throughout my district and the State.

The bills enjoyed widespread support in Lawrence County where the proposed wilderness land is located. The bills were endorsed by the county tax assessor, the county tax collector, the Lawrence County Association of Elected Officials, the local members of the State judiciary, the local chamber of commerce and a wide spectrum of public and private citizens.

The wilderness expansion bills of 1982 and 1983 were widely supported throughout the State of Alabama. The bills were endorsed by every major newspaper in my district and throughout the State. The Governor, Lieutenant Governor, the State attorney general, the State treasurer, the State auditor, the director of the Alabama Bureau of Publicity and Information, the commissioner of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and the State Director of the Division of Game and Fish also supported the bill. In addition, the mayors of Anniston, Birmingham, Montgomery, and Decatur, AL endorsed the bills as did the Birmingham City Council, the Jefferson County Commission, the Lauderdale County Commission, the Bass Anglers Sportsman Society, the Lewis Smith Lake Civil Association and the city of Vestavia Hills, AL.

Despite the widespread level of support throughout Alabama, the bills passed by the House in 1982 and 1983 were not enacted into law. A few within the State demanded further negotiations and concessions.

The bill I am introducing today is the product of lengthy and tortuous negotiations and compromise extending over 3 years. This bill satisfies an estimated 99 percent of the concerns of the interested parties on both sides of the issue. I must admit that there are parties on both sides of the issue who apparently will never endorse a proposal that does not satisfy their every wish and whim.

The time has come, however, to put the hay in the barn and fully protect these priceless acres of Alabama.

The Alabama Wilderness Act of 1986 is really consistent with the Land and Resource Management Plan prepared for the National Forests in Alabama by the Forest Service and published last March. This plan recommended

increasing wilderness area in Alabama by 9,793 to 18,720 acres. The Management Plan determined "that any wilderness acreage selected by Congress within a range of 9,793 to 19,350 acres would not appreciably affect the production of other nonwilderness goods and services".

The commercial forest land base in Alabama is the third largest in the Nation. Only Georgia and Oregon have more commercial forest land than Alabama. Two-thirds of the land in Alabama or 21.3 million acres are covered by forest. Some of this forest land located in the southern half of the State is among the most productive in the country. The expanded Sipsey Wilderness proposed in the bill I am introducing today of a little more than 30,000 acres would only amount to less than six-tenths of 1 percent of the total land area in Alabama and less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the total commercial forest land in Alabama.

Like most other Southern States, 75 percent of Alabama's commercial forest land is owned and controlled by thousands of nonindustrial private owners. Our forestry industry depends on free timber markets with many participants for most of its wood supply. Public forest lands account for only 1 million acres of the total commercial forest lands in Alabama. The expanded wilderness that I am proposing would amount to less than 5 percent of the total public forest lands in Alabama.

This legislation proposes to include in the National Wilderness Preservation System approximately 28,500 acres, encompassing a network of canyon-enclosed streams and tributaries flowing directly into the existing Sipsey Wilderness Area, and culminating there in the formation of the West Fork Sipsey River. The protection thus afforded to a virtual entire watershed benefits our State and Nation by preserving a complete eco-system harboring a nationally renowned refuge for unique plant and animal life; by assuring the permanent physical integrity of the beautiful West Fork Sipsey River, which has been designated by this Congress for study as a potential unit of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; and by helping maintain the purity of Lewis Smith Reservoir downstream, a major source of water supply for Alabama's largest city.

The canyons of the Sipsey, formed by tributaries slicing through massive, flat-lying sandstone beds, have long been recognized as a refuge for a unique diversity of life forms; 78 species of fish, including two unnamed, endemic darters, inhabit the Bankhead Forest's remote streams. The gorges and uplands provide habitat for 80 species of woodland birds, many of which must have hardwood to survive. The Sipsey has a full range of mammals, including not only abundant game wildlife, but also otter, mink, beaver, raccoon, opossum, shrews, bats, and—a true relic of ancient times—elusive evidence of mountain lion. The geology of the area is particularly remarkable, with precipitous cliffs and massive boulders revealing plant and animal fossils from the dim past.

But the Sipsey's greatest renown lies in its unique botany, resulting in part from the remarkable coincidence of three geographic regions, the Coastal Plain, Appalachian Moun-

tains, and the Piedmont Plateau, and three frost zones in one area. In consequence, the deep, shadowy, and moist canyons harbor a plant fauna of unusual size, diversity, distribution, or rarity, some very demanding in habitat. Moreover, receding glaciers from the ice age have left within the narrow gorges a remnant of such northern trees as the Canada Hemlock and sweet birch, and 22 other plants which reach their southern limit in the Bankhead National Forest.

The watershed is also a refuge for the kind of old-growth hardwood forest which once covered the Eastern United States, but which survives now only in such remote areas as the Sipsey's canyons. According to U.S. Forest Service data, hardwood trees over 60 years of age constitute the single most predominant type in the acreage here proposed for inclusion in the wilderness. A few of the most inaccessible canyons contain coves harboring virgin stands of both hardwood and conifer, notably hemlock. A visitor to the proposed wilderness sees a forest that is overwhelmingly old growth, naturally regenerated, predominantly hardwood.

Honeycombed by canyons, the land involved in this legislation is not appropriate for intensive timber production. In 1971, the U.S. Forest Service performed a hydrological analysis of the entire watershed of the proposed wilderness and found that most of the acreage was inappropriate for intensive management due to a high erosion hazard and potential for intolerable solid damage on the steep slopes and floodplains. Indeed, according to current U.S. Forest Service data, less than one-fourth of the acreage included in their RARE II "further planning" areas here lends itself to intensive management, and this is restricted to the narrow divides between canyons. However, because the unique ecology of the canyons are dependent upon a water supply from slope wash and subsurface seepage from the divides, clearcutting, roadbuilding and other disruptive practices there can radically impact the canyons flooding them in wet seasons and desiccating them during drought. Therefore, the physical integrity of both the existing wilderness, and the expanded wilderness as here proposed, dictate that all of the land involved in this legislation be included in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

In the Sipsey, abundant water and sheltering walls enclose an island of the past. Sheer sandstone cliffs, crowned with mountain laurel and filled with rare ferns and wildflowers, rear above the steep valley slopes. Hundreds of waterfalls cascade down the rock walls or plunge to the valley floors. Numerous rock shelters occur throughout the miles of gorges, and monstrous boulders lie shattered at the base of the cliffs. Here indeed one finds outstanding opportunities for solitude and (the) primitive, unconfined form of recreation required by the Wilderness Act of 1964.

The Alabama Wilderness Act of 1986 differs in many respects from the 1982 and 1983 proposals to expand the Sipsey Wilderness. For the most part these changes reflect years of negotiations and compromise, the development of new information and data, the publication of the Final Management Plan for the National Forests in Alabama in March of this year, and the completion of the studies neces-

sary to justify adding the Sipsey River to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

In 1982 and again in 1983, the House passed legislation that proposed expanding the Sipsey Wilderness by 29,500 acres. The Alabama Wilderness Act of 1986 would add only about 17,700 acres. This represents a reduction of 11,800 acres or 40 percent from the original proposals.

The Alabama Wilderness Act of 1986 differs also because it includes language designating approximately 9,500 acres around the free flowing Sipsey River as part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. This is a welcomed addition to this legislation.

The waters of the Sipsey River flow down through Alabama feeding the water supply for numerous towns and cities including the major metropolitan area of Birmingham, AL. The enactment of the Alabama Wilderness Act of 1986 would ensure the quality of this water supply by expanding the wilderness and protecting the river canyons that surround this watershed.

In addition the bill provides for added protection by including specific language directing the Secretary of Agriculture to monitor and maintain the quality of the water in the Sipsey River.

In earlier versions of this bill, I proposed keeping the so-called Northwest Road that runs from east to west along the top of the existing Sipsey Wilderness area open. After careful study and discussions with the Forest Service and others, I have decided to delete this provision from the Alabama Wilderness Act of 1986. This decision is based on a number of factors.

This road would bisect an expanded wilderness area and complicate the management of the entire area. In addition, maintaining the road in the middle of wilderness would be very expensive. The road cuts through a canyon, is very steep in parts and contains a number of switchbacks—all of which are expensive to maintain. The individuals who use this road have pointed out that the Ridge Road provides a convenient alternative route. The continued use of the road is not compatible with the wilderness concept.

There is also another reason for closing the road related to travel by horse. Horseback riding enthusiasts throughout the Southeast have long recognized that the Sipsey Wilderness is an ideal area for horseback riding. Unfortunately, the Forest Service currently bans travel by horse in the Sipsey Wilderness. I intend to press as I did successfully in 1982 and 1983 to include report language that would open an expanded wilderness to horseback riding. The closing of the Northwest Road would provide the Forest Service with the opportunity to develop an ideal horse trail.

Mr. Speaker, the infestation of the southern pine beetle in my State is creating havoc through the forest lands. This problem is of vital concern to everyone dependent upon the forest lands for their livelihood and recreation. The Federal, State and local authorities in Alabama are extending vast amounts of time, money and energy in the battle to stop this infestation. I am pleased to note that the Forest Service has published an environmental impact statement describing their plans and policies regarding this problem. I want to pro-

vide the Forest Service with the maximum amount of flexibility necessary to assist them in their work. This will be reflected in report language.

Mr. Speaker, the Alabama Wilderness Act of 1986 is the product of countless hours of intense study and negotiations on the part of many Alabamians. The widespread interest in this issue has enabled me to benefit from the advice and recommendations of large numbers of knowledgeable Alabamians with expertise in forestry, conservation, tourism, recreation, and education. I want to take this opportunity to thank each for their patience, participation, and contribution.

The Sipsey Wilderness has been the subject of extensive hearings in the House. The Subcommittee on Public Lands and the Committee on Agriculture both conducted hearings on this subject in 1982 and 1983.

I want to thank and commend Mr. SEIBERLING, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Mr. DE LA GARZA, chairman of the Agriculture Committee for their patience, understanding and considerable contributions to this legislation. They along with their colleagues who serve on their respective committees and their staff have been a great source of encouragement and wise counsel throughout the many years we have worked on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Alabama Wilderness Act of 1986.

A TRIBUTE TO DUANE NIGHTINGALE

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Duane Nightingale, an exceptional American whom I have had the privilege of knowing for many years.

As the customer relations manager of General Telephone Co. in Santa Monica, Duane is a visible and respected figure in the greater Los Angeles community. In addition to his role at General Telephone, Duane donates his time and talents to a number of civic organizations where he has served as president of the Santa Monica Kiwanis, the Navy League, director of the Santa Monica Boys Club, director of the YMCA, first vice chairman of the Salvation Army advisory board, director of the Santa Monica College Associates.

It has always been a pleasure to work with Duane and a recent article in the Evening Outlook revealed that a number of people share similar feelings. I ask permission to reprint this glowing profile which offers an accurate portrayal of a very special man.

A TRIBUTE TO DUANE NIGHTINGALE

(By Will Thorne)

Among the plaques and commendations that line the walls of Duane Nightingale's office—last one on the right, second row from the top, to be exact—is one naming him the Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce's "Ambassador of the Month."

The title given for the period of July to August 1984, has long expired, but it so

neatly describes Nightingale's job that it still seems apt and current.

"It's a pretty good descriptive term," agreed Nightingale, who is actually described in the General Telephone Co. table of organization as the firm's "customer relations manager."

"And it works both ways, too. I represent the company here in the community of Santa Monica—and sometimes I find myself representing the community to the company. I'm here to help out whoever needs to be helped."

Nightingale, who started with — a pole-climbing lineman 31 years ago, is the first company ambassador, a post that was created in 1981 after years in which the company suffered the slings and darts of a public outraged at what it considered the poorest service.

"In those years, we had quite an image problem," said Nightingale. "It was felt that somebody active in the community and working with the community could help to improve that image."

"When I was asked to do the job, they said they would like me to get out and tell our story—but they were not sure how I was to go about it and they could not offer any guidelines."

Wiser still was a GTC decision to plow enough money into its Santa Monica and Westside facilities to make the system work as well as any U.S. system can said Nightingale.

"The company spent a lot of money in the community to improve the system," he said. "Without that happening nothing I could have done would have worked."

Has it been a success?

Yes, Nightingale said without hesitation, "I feel very strongly that this has been a success."

The community seems to agree with him—and the reason it names for success is most often Nightingale himself.

"He's one of my very favorite people in the whole world," said Bernice Bratter, executive director of the Senior Health and Peer Counseling Center. "He's such a kind, decent caring type of person. Duane really cares. He has given us a lot of help with our work."

Pete Barrett a community-oriented businessman and himself a volunteer worker for a number of Santa Monica organizations, finds Nightingale a "very hard worker."

"I've been with him at committee meetings at 7:30 in the morning and again as late as 9:30 or 10 o'clock at night," he said.

"He really is a good guy," said City Manager John Jalili. "Whenever we have contacted Duane on any issue, whether it's dealing with senior center bond act monies or the need for telephones in the park, he's always been very prompt and most helpful."

Over the years, Nightingale has won a reputation both for being influential and in a city where clefs have been deep between political factions, something of a power broker.

"He's a very objective and he looks at other points of view," said Aubrey Austin, board chairman of Santa Monica Bank. "He's a no-nonsense guy with a good common-sense approach. He doesn't get ruffled."

"He's been very helpful to this office," said Carol Kurtz, administrative aide to Assemblyman Tom Hayden, D-Santa Monica, Malibu. "It's almost like you don't know where he stands politically."

The winner of all these kudos was born 52 years ago in Norfolk, Neb., the middle of

three children of a salesman who took whatever work he could to keep his family going, and moved it to Denver when Duane was only 5.

Throughout high school, Nightingale worked to support himself at such jobs as sweeper boy for the school district and theater usher, and dreamed of becoming an architect.

"I always thought that would be an exciting profession to design buildings," he said. "But I just couldn't afford to go on past high school."

In 1955, at the age of 21, he joined General Telephone in Redondo Beach and, within six months, was a cable splicer. But in October 1961, when GTC started looking for an ambassador, Nightingale had worked his way up to area service operations manager in Santa Monica—and was already a known quantity in the community.

He was a past president of Santa Monica Kiwanis and the Navy League, director of the Santa Monica Boys Club, director of the YMCA, first vice chairman of the Salvation Army advisory board, director of Santa Monica College Associates and member of the college's advisory board and a host of others.

Among his honors were commendations from the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and awards as Lion of the Year, Navy Leaguer of the Year and—of course—the chamber's nomination as Ambassador of the Month.

"That's why I was chosen because I was already active in the community," he said.

"And I still would be, even if it wasn't my job," he added. This isn't work. It's fun."

TRANSMISSION OF AIDS

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the AIDS epidemic continues to claim more Americans' lives, a great deal of confusion has arisen about the danger of transmission of this disease by means other than sexual contact, use of unclean needles, or from pregnant woman to fetus. I would like to call my colleagues' attention to two particular documents, demonstrating that, while AIDS is an extremely serious illness, it is not an easy one to transmit or catch.

The first is an article from the New England Journal of Medicine by Dr. Merle Sande. I find it to be a clear summary of the disease and the lack of any transmission through nonsexual, nonblood contact.

The second is a summary of a paper presented at the international conference on AIDS this summer, which lays out possibly the worst case imaginable—a violent, brain-damaged hemophiliac man with the HIV virus. Even in this worst case—involving biting and scratching—no transmission or even exposure occurred.

I commend these articles to my colleagues.

TRANSMISSION OF AIDS—THE CASE AGAINST CASUAL CONTAGION

(By Merle A. Sande, M.D.)

The epidemic of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) has become an epidemic of fear. Although our understanding of the disease has been progressing rapidly,

the new knowledge has often produced more public concern than relief. The identification of the etiologic agent as a virus—although of critical scientific importance—did little to quell the fears of either the medical community or the general population. Instead, people reacted to the fact that AIDS is caused by a virus with a hysteria reminiscent of another viral infection—the polio epidemic of the early 1950s.

As each new observation was announced, concern intensified. Isolation of the virus from semen explained the rapid spread of the disease in the sexually active male homosexual population but also aroused the fear of potential spread in the heterosexual population. The recognition of an asymptomatic-carrier state amplified the fear of sexual contagion in our society, and that fear was further intensified by reports of widespread transmission of the AIDS virus by heterosexual activity in Africa. The recognition that contaminated blood and blood products were the vectors for transmission of the virus to transfusion recipients and patients with hemophilia and that intravenous drug users acquired the infection by sharing needles raised the possibility that health care workers could be at similar risk from occupational exposure. Probably the most sensational information, and perhaps the most misleading, was that the virus had been isolated from saliva and then from tears. This suggested to the public that the disease might be spread by food handlers, by kissing or shaking hands, or even by contact with fomites. The media did little to dispel these notions; on the contrary, the public was led to believe that AIDS was a highly contagious disease.

The belief that the AIDS virus can be transmitted by casual contact has produced numerous political, legal, and ethical dilemmas. Responses have been varied, including calls for quarantine, mass screening of all potentially infected persons, expulsion from military service of all antibody-positive personnel, and exclusion of infected children from schools. In some cases refusal to care for AIDS patients has been condoned.

Throughout the epidemic, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) has had a critical role in countering such reactions. Rational guidelines (based on the best available data on the modes of transmission) for preventing the transmission of the AIDS virus were developed and widely publicized early in the course of the epidemic. However, the response of public officials has been erratic, and the public remains confused.

Where are we now, five years after the epidemic became evident? First of all, although the epidemic is still increasing at an alarming rate nationwide, there is some indication that the rate of increase is slowing in certain areas, such as New York City, and in San Francisco the number of new cases has actually been constant for the past year. This observation may reflect a slowing of the rate of viral acquisition. According to one recent epidemiologic survey in San Francisco, only 5 percent of seronegative homosexual men acquired evidence of infection between 1984 and 1985 (Moss AR: personal communication).

Secondly, and surprisingly, the disease has remained confined largely to the high-risk groups (homosexual men, intravenous drug users, patients with hemophilia and persons who received transfusions before blood screening was introduced, and the offspring and sexual partners of members of these groups), and the distribution of cases among these groups has been remarkably constant

throughout the epidemic. In only 5 percent of cases is the mode of transmission unknown. Thus, there is no evidence that the disease is spreading to other populations.

Thirdly, certain factors have been shown to potentiate the transmission of the AIDS virus in the high-risk groups. Very early in the epidemic, studies from the CDC demonstrated that the risk of spread in the homosexual male population correlated with the number of sexual partners. This behavior accounted for the rapid dissemination of the disease throughout the country. Rectal receptive intercourse and the exchange of blood through the sharing of needles are activities that promote viral transmission. These activities may allow fluids containing infected cells to enter the circulation of the uninfected recipient.

In addition, intrauterine spread or vertical transmission of the disease from mother to fetus is an established mode of transmission. The chance that an infected mother will transmit the virus to her unborn offspring may be as high as 50 percent. Unfortunately, clinical AIDS is much more likely to develop in an infected infant than in an infected adult. The virus has been isolated from breast milk, and breast feeding could represent another mode of transmission.

Furthermore, there seems to be no doubt that the disease can be spread by heterosexual sex. Although heterosexual transmission has been postulated as the predominant mode of transmission in equatorial Africa, studies conclusively documenting this remain to be published. That the virus can be transmitted from men to women during vaginal intercourse is supported by the fact that female prostitutes in Africa appear to be at extremely high risk of infection. According to the CDC (CDC AIDS program: personal communication), the total number of such cases in the United States in which heterosexual transmission has been implicated remains low—only 180 so far—and the disease in 152 of these cases was transmitted from a man to a woman. On the other hand, examples of sexual transmission from a woman to a man are more difficult to document; only 28 cases have been reported in the United States.

It is possible that the difference between the two sexes in the rate of transmission is due to the fact that there are more male intravenous drug users and bisexuals capable of transmitting the disease to women than there are infected women capable of transmitting the virus to men. Although it would appear that the potential for the future spread of this disease in the heterosexual community remains a serious problem, we still do not know the relative risk of spread of the virus through vaginal intercourse and are even less secure in our knowledge about transmission from women to men. To date there is no evidence that the disease is spread by oral intercourse or by kissing.

Finally, remarkably consistent current data indicate that occupational exposure to patients infected with the AIDS virus does not pose a serious risk to health care workers. Over 1750 health care workers with intense exposure to patients with AIDS have been studied for evidence of antibody to the AIDS virus. Of the workers not otherwise members of high-risk groups (e.g., homosexual men or intravenous drug abusers), less than 0.1 percent were found to be antibody positive. In our institution (San Francisco General Hospital), more than 300 health care workers with intense and sustained exposure to patients with AIDS for nearly four years have been studied; all are anti-

body negative, with the exception of 14 of 50 homosexual male hospital workers (Gerberding JL: personal communication).

Can the disease be contracted by an accidental needle stick with a needle contaminated by blood from a patient with AIDS? Probably yes, but with an extremely low frequency (less than 0.5 percent). Only one documented case, in a British nurse who acquired the virus after actually receiving a microinjection of blood after an arterial puncture, has been reported. Three additional cases of possible needle-stick transmission in the United States have been suggested but not proved. One worker was not available for followup, and the other two denied high-risk activity; it is possible that in each of these three cases, acquisition of the virus could have been through one of the more well-described routes. In addition, over 660 subjects (including one who acquired hepatitis B) with needle sticks from infected needles have been studied and found not to have seroconverted. The low frequency of transmission of the AIDS virus by accidental needle stick as compared with that of hepatitis B, in which 20 to 30 percent of those so exposed acquire the virus, may be due to the large differences in the concentrations of infectious particles in the blood (up to $10^{1.3}$ viral particles per milliliter for hepatitis B, as compared with 10^4 for AIDS). One can therefore conclude that caring for AIDS patients, even when there is intensive exposure to contaminated secretions, is not a high-risk activity. Infection-control committees should therefore implement policies to minimize accidental needle sticks and develop infection-control procedures based on the current CDC recommendations.

The article by Friedland et al. in this issue offers strong supporting evidence that the AIDS virus is not transmitted by casual contact, even within a family unit in which there is intimate contact with infected persons. Of 101 subjects tested who were living in a household with a documented carrier of the AIDS virus, none acquired the virus, and it seems clear that the one antibody-positive subject was infected by vertical transmission in utero or at the time of birth. The implications of this study are strengthened by the fact that the infection-control procedures followed by many health care workers were obviously not employed in the families studied. The duration of exposure reported was certainly sufficient, and the interactions numerous enough, to provide every opportunity for the virus to be spread within the family if such transmission was likely. Other, smaller family studies have produced results consistent with those of Friedland et al. Only 1 of 35 household members associated with 14 seropositive Danish patients with hemophilia had serum antibody to the AIDS virus (human T-cell lymphotropic virus Type III [HTLV-III]). This person had engaged in vaginal, oral, and anal intercourse with one of the infected patients with hemophilia. The failure of the virus to spread in the secretion-rich environment of the family may in part be explained by the very low isolation rate recently reported in samples of saliva. Ho and his colleagues could isolate HTLV-III from only 1 of 83 saliva samples cultured from antibody-positive subjects, although the virus was detected in 28 of the 50 blood samples tested from the same population. Others have confirmed these studies.

The picture is therefore clear. The AIDS virus is spread sexually, by the injection of

contaminated blood, and vertically from mother to fetus. Other modes of transmission are extremely rare. Persons at high risk of acquiring the virus are men who are homosexually and bisexually active, intravenous drug abusers, persons receiving infected blood product intravenously, and children born of infected mothers. At intermediate risk are persons, especially women, who engage in heterosexual sex with members of high-risk groups. Groups whose members are highly unlikely to acquire the virus (i.e., virtually no-risk groups) include health care workers caring for AIDS patients and anyone who has casual contact with persons infected with the AIDS virus, including food handlers, schoolchildren, co-workers, and family members. On the basis of these facts, the keys to preventing transmission of the virus are (1) the screening of all donated blood and (2) education and other attempts to modify risky sexual behavior and intravenous drug abuse.

It is now time for members of the medical profession, armed with this knowledge, to take a more active and influential role in quelling the hysteria over the casual transmission of AIDS. We need to support public and medical officials who oppose universal screening, quarantine, the exclusion of students from classrooms, and the removal of employees, including health care workers, from the work place.⁷ The evidence presented by Friedland et al. is a powerful argument with which to counter the public's fear of casual contagion and should be used to thwart attempts to discriminate against persons in the so-called high-risk groups.

SUMMARY OF PAPER PRESENTED AT THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AIDS

Risk of Transmission of HTLV III/LAV from Human Bites. C. Tsoukas T. Hadjis, L. Theberge, P. Gold, M. O'Shaughnessy, P. Feorino. Montreal General Hospital, Hôpital Notre Dame de la Merci, Montreal, QC, Canada; CDC, Atlanta, GA.

HTLV III/LAV is known to be transmitted through intimate sexual contact, IV drug abuse or via blood transfusions. Casual contact in public schools should not constitute a risk of transmission of this virus. Arguments for keeping infected children out of school arise from concerns for potential exchange of blood or saliva via cuts, bites or bleeding. To examine the relative risk of transmission of this virus via bites and scratches, we studied 188 health care workers who were in contact with a brain damaged hemophiliac with AIDS-related complex (ARC). This 36-year old man suffered extensive neurologic impairment following a motor vehicle accident and now exhibits violent behaviour, including biting and scratching those around him. In a two-year period while he had typical manifestations of ARC, he inflicted bites and scratches on 30 health care workers causing skin puncture wounds with residual scars. His mouth was frequently full of saliva and blood, his fingernails soiled with semen, feces and urine.

Extensive immune evaluation was carried out on all personnel six months after skin trauma. All were normal and there were no significant differences between the bite and casual contact groups. All persons bitten or scratched were HTLV III/LAV antibody negative by Western blotting. The patient was antibody positive and his peripheral blood lymphocytes were virus positive on co-culture with H9 cells. Lymphocytes of 25 exposed individuals tested were culture negative.

We conclude that this patient with ARC, proven viremic for HTLV III/LAV and producing copious amounts of body fluids, failed to infect those caring for him even through the extensive skin trauma produced by bites and scratches. Thus the risk of transmission of this virus from bites and scratches under similar conditions should be very low.

WHY THE DOG DIDN'T BARK IN ANGOLA

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a recent Washington Times article by syndicated columnist Cord Meyer (August 29, 1986) provides an insightful analysis of the current situation in Angola. The article provides a useful update on recent events there and describes a military standoff that could spur negotiations which might lead to national reconciliation. This is the laudable goal of the Reagan administration and it should be supported by those of us in the Congress.

Mr. Meyer argues that the Marxist "MPLA leadership will not negotiate with UNITA as long as it has reason to hope that UNITA's access to U.S. arms will be terminated." It is clear that applying broad restrictions on the President's ability to conduct our Nation's foreign policy is not in the best interests of the United States, nor does it help the subjugated people of Angola. The article, which follows, is must reading prior to upcoming consideration of the Intelligence authorization bill.

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 29, 1986]

WHY THE DOG DIDN'T BARK IN ANGOLA (By Cord Meyer)

Just as the dog that did not bark provided the crucial clue in the Sherlock Holmes story, so the failure to date of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) to mount its long-threatened general offensive successfully is a critically important non-event.

It is the best evidence that military victory over Jonas Savimbi's UNITA guerrillas may be slipping beyond the reach of Moscow's Angolan satellite.

After last fall's powerful MPLA attack caught UNITA by surprise and almost overwhelmed Mr. Savimbi's main southern base, the Soviets appear to have decided to go for broke this year to knock UNITA out of the war before the newly authorized flow of covert American arms can improve Mr. Savimbi's chances.

After the tripartite Soviet-Angolan-Cuban consultations held in Moscow in January 1986, General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev asserted that "no one should have any doubts about the Soviet Union's unswerving commitment" to Angola. To make good on that promise, the Soviets have not only replaced all the equipment lost by the Angolan army in last year's fighting but have poured in additional modern fighter bombers, helicopter gunships, tanks, and radar to re-equip the 60,000 MPLA army and the 35,000 Cuban troops in Angola.

Faced with this formidable attempt to destroy once and for all the 50,000 UNITA guerrillas, Mr. Savimbi has carried out a

brilliantly conceived and well-executed preemptive strategy of keeping President Eduardo dos Santos's Angolan army continually off balance. By raids against the oil installations in Cabinda and against the diamond mines and coffee plantations in the northeast, UNITA commanders have forced the MPLA to defend on a wide front and so far have prevented the concentration necessary for a successful attack on UNITA's southern base.

Finally, this month as the MPLA built up at Cuito Cuanavale the armor and ammunition for a major offensive, Mr. Savimbi struck preemptively with the new American anti-aircraft and anti-tank weapons his men have quickly learned how to use. On one day, the MPLA forces lost six military helicopters. Although heavy fighting still continues, both Pentagon officials and UNITA representatives in Washington are optimistic that, with the rains due in five weeks, the MPLA has almost run out of time to conduct its planned offensive.

In a demonstration of his confidence that he has fought the MPLA to a stalemate, Mr. Savimbi has announced the holding of UNITA's national congress at his southern capital at Jamba in a few weeks, and more than 2,000 delegates are expected to attend from within the country and abroad.

According to those who have spoken with MPLA President Eduardo dos Santos and his Cabinet ministers, the MPLA leaders attribute their failure to destroy UNITA to three major factors.

First, the UNITA spoiling offensive in the north and central regions forced them to disperse their forces and to resupply some towns by air.

Second, the repeal of the Clark Amendment and the Reagan administration's decision to supply American weapons to Mr. Savimbi covertly made any attack on UNITA's southern base much more costly and dangerous.

Third, the plunge in world oil prices has cut the MPLA's hard currency earnings from \$1.7 billion last year to an estimated \$900 million this year. President dos Santos is understandably reluctant to risk in an offensive gamble modern weapons that he may not have the money to replace.

If, as now seems likely, UNITA has fought the MPLA to a standstill, the heavy rains in October will severely restrict the fighting until next spring, and the question is whether the military standoff can become the motive for the genuine negotiation toward national reconciliation that has always been Mr. Savimbi's basic objective.

According to reliable sources, there have been contacts between MPLA and UNITA officials but no evidence yet that Mr. dos Santos is ready to talk. The hard-line faction in the MPLA will predictably press for another Soviet-backed effort next year to destroy UNITA, while the moderates in the MPLA are known to favor negotiations with Mr. Savimbi and a Cuban troop withdrawal.

The current movement in the U.S. House of Representatives to end all covert funding to UNITA and to require that future American support to Mr. Savimbi be debated openly and provided overtly will give the Soviets and their MPLA allies a potent argument against negotiations at this time.

The African states through which covert American assistance has to pass cannot participate in an openly conducted aid program because of their diplomatic relations with Luanda. In effect, Democratic Rep. Lee Hamilton of Indiana, as chairman of the House intelligence committee, will only suc-

ceed in cutting off all U.S. military assistance to Mr. Savimbi, if he succeeds, through his proposed amendment, in making aid overt.

Moreover, the MPLA leadership will not negotiate with UNITA as long as it has reason to hope that UNITA's access to U.S. arms will be terminated.

RESEARCHERS DISCOVER SECRET BLOOD BATH IN COMMUNIST VIETNAM

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today saddened by revelations of absolutely incredible human right atrocities which heretofore have gone unnoticed in Communist Vietnam. Very credible evidence has surfaced which details mass executions, torture, and total human degradation at the direction of Vietnam's Communist dictators. These inhumane Communist thugs have been able to accomplish such enormous brutalities because the Western World accepts their guise of re-education of their non-Communist population. Mr. Speaker, let's wake up and recognize the true nature of Communism and totalitarian societies!

It has come to my attention that two University of California at Berkeley researchers have discovered that between 1975 and 1983 at least 65,000 politically motivated murders and executions have taken place behind that despicable curtain of silence which shrouds the Soviet-backed Government of Vietnam. A bloodbath of this dimension can only occur without the world's outrage in a totalitarian society which insulates itself from all Western scrutiny and wields absolute power at the expense of its own population.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to the RECORD the following Reader's Digest article which tells this sad tale. In reading this article, I urge my colleagues, particularly those who constantly make excuses for Communist nations, to remember that these atrocities take place with the blessing, and moral and economic support of that scourge of the civilized world—the Soviet Union. Gentlemen, please don't ever refer to a Communist society as America's moral equivalent!

ON THE TRAIL OF A HIDDEN MASSACRE

(By Ralph Kinney Bennett)

One evening in December 1981, in Berkeley, Calif., Professors Jacqueline Desbarats and Karl Jackson were studying the first batch of completed questionnaires for a survey they were conducting. Then, like some monster bursting unexpectedly from placid waters, the words leaped off the pages: "A whole group killed . . ." "Many prisoners executed . . ." "Two majors killed in concentration camp." Startled, Jackson spilled a cup of coffee over the papers. He quickly mopped up the mess—then read on.

The survey had started as two routine academic studies—Jackson's at the University of California in Berkeley and Desbarats's at Northwestern University in Evanston, Ill. Jackson, 39, wanted to determine the extent of political repression in Vietnam since the

end of the war in 1975. Desbarats, 38, a geography specialist, wanted to study the migration of Vietnamese who had settled in the United States after 1975. Overall, Jackson and Desbarats wondered, what had caused this massive migration by a people who had suffered much, but in their long history had seldom fled from the place of suffering?

Both surveys involved systematic interviews of representative samples of Vietnamese. So the two scholars decided to pool their resources, which included a modest grant of \$25,000 from the National Science Foundation. Over the ensuing months, the two academics fashioned a detailed questionnaire with more than 100 questions, designed to elicit a reliable picture of the Vietnam exodus. One section dealt with motivation—what caused the refugees to leave their homeland in the first place. It probed their experiences with political repression, forced relocation and the government's so-called reeducation camps.

GENTLE PRYING

The concerns of Karl Jackson and Jacqueline Desbarats were shared by human-rights activist Ginetta Sagan.¹ Sagan had condemned human-rights abuses by the old South Vietnamese regime and was becoming increasingly concerned about what was happening in the wake of North Vietnam's takeover. With meager funds, she had begun her own painful harvest of cries and whispers from refugees in the United States and France. Now, partly at Sagan's urging, Desbarats and Jackson added questions about all forms of political repression, including executions.

The two researchers tested their questionnaire in the Vietnamese community in Chicago. Vietnamese university students were hired and trained to conduct the interviews, which often took several hours. Right off, one thing became evident, something that could not be quantified by statistics; fear. Many refugees were afraid to tell what they had seen. Some of the information had to be gently pried out of them.

And it was this information, stark and chilling, that surprised Desbarats and Jackson when they reviewed the first survey results. As the two scholars pored over each page, it became part of a crazy quilt of horror. One Vietnamese told of a village chief disemboweled by his captors after being dragged through a mob and beaten. Someone else described how a former South Vietnamese soldier was shot to death in front of his house because he had "shouted words against the communist government." Another told of two inmates "released" from a re-education camp, then shot to death just outside the gates. "Trials" lasted two minutes, if that long. Every third respondent knew of at least one person who had been executed—and sometimes many.

"When we began our research," Jackson recalls, "we expected high estimates on the population camps but virtually no positive responses on political executions. We had accepted the conventional wisdom that no large-scale killing had occurred. The execution questions were added almost as an afterthought."

Besides, Hanoi had promised a new government of "reconciliation and concord" that would "prohibit all acts of reprisal and discrimination" against its former enemies. Emphasis would be on "re-educating" the

South Vietnamese. Despite news of ill treatment in the campus, despite the "boat people" pouring out of Vietnam in a hemorrhage of misery, the world took the communists at their word. Former Sen. George McGovern declared, after a visit, that the blood bath was "one of the great false alarms of all time." As late as 1983, a State Department analysis concluded: "Execution for purely political acts is not accepted policy."

CURTAIN OF SILENCE

At first, Jackson and Desbarats agreed on a "rational" explanation for their unexpected findings. These initial questionnaires were from a "snowball sample"—a survey technique in which successive interviewees recommended others from among friends and social contacts. This could bias the sample; they might have hit a pocket of right-wing former supporters of Nguyen Van Thieu's regime, people more likely to have met reprisals and to make up stories putting Hanoi in a bad light.

Perhaps more research, using larger, rigidly random samples, would eliminate this apparent anomaly. They agreed to try it. But Jackson wondered about all those reports of killings.

In the months and years following the fall of South Vietnam, Hanoi had clamped a near total blackout on developments within its borders, so it was hard to know what was happening. In 1978, French journalist Ronald-Pierre Paringaux, who had been a scathing critic of South Vietnam and U.S. support of its government, wrote ruefully that "a curtain of silence has fallen in Vietnam on the subject of human rights." Jackson thought of that curtain now. Was it possible that behind it, hidden from the world, an orgy of retribution had indeed been taking place?

To broaden their survey sample, the pair picked two additional areas with high concentrations of Vietnamese refugees—San Francisco and the Orange County suburbs of Los Angeles. French-born Desbarats confessed she was largely aloof from the political aspects of what the two were uncovering. She emphasized the use of the most conservative methodology in gathering and analyzing the interview information. She poured over the questions. Were they perfectly clear? Were they completely neutral? Did they avoid such pitfalls as one question suggesting the "right" answers to the next one?

In kitchens and living rooms of "Little Saigons" around Los Angeles and San Francisco, trained student helpers conducted more than 500 interviews from June to December 1982. As the questionnaires were translated, the percentages of the Chicago sample held up. One of every three Vietnamese interviewed had personal knowledge of executions, and they poured out an awful catalogue of killing:

"Witnessed execution of a leader of the Hoa Hao religion who was imprisoned in the same barracks as me. He was stabbed in the belly and his head was cut off in public."

"Twenty people were caught trying to escape. Nineteen were shot on the boat. The other was killed on shore."

"A lieutenant colonel tried to escape from the Lang Son re-education camp. He was buried alive."

The sheer horror of the stories made it all the more imperative that their authenticity be established, either as isolated occurrences or as part of a larger pattern. In analyzing their results, the two scholars used strict statistical methods. And they set clear

ground rules about the data they would accept: the survey would not include deaths in the re-education camps caused by overwork, disease, malnutrition or suicide, or people "accidentally" killed when they were forced to clear old mine fields.

FINAL PROOF

Fully 35 percent of the respondents reported they either saw or had heard of political executions. And over a third of these gave eyewitness accounts, most of them providing names, dates, places, reasons. These details were vital. "Otherwise," says Jackson, "it was entirely possible they could all be reporting the same, relatively small number of executions." Through meticulous cross-indexing, the two scholars eliminated duplication, which accounted for only 34 percent of the original total.

Finally, Jackson and Desbarats consulted statisticians to come up with a sophisticated methodology that would allow them, as fairly as possible, to project their survey figures for Vietnam as a whole. This involved analyzing the nature of the two Vietnamese "populations"—the one inside the country and the more than one million refugees who had fled—and developing a system for deflating the number of executions to allow for duplication or exaggeration.

Their final, carefully extrapolated figure for the number of victims killed by political violence between 1975 and 1983: at least sixty-five thousand.

By now, Jackson and Desbarats had no doubts that the phenomenon they had detected was real: a blood bath had occurred. Still, they delayed release of their findings, deciding to go one step further. "Perhaps there was something unique about the refugees who found their way to America," Desbarats reasoned. "Maybe moderate and left-wing South Vietnamese who engendered less retribution from the new government settled elsewhere—most likely, France."

To extend their study, however, the two needed more funds. They found it tough going. Jackson still feels strongly that the emerging facts about executions had, in some quarters, turned social science into "politics." "It seemed fairly obvious that some funding sources didn't want to lay a finger on something that opened up a new and frightening dimension to Vietnam," Jackson says.

Undaunted, the two scholars scraped up enough money to conduct research in four of the largest cities of France: Paris, Nice, Lyon and Toulouse. After nine more months of surveying, the U.S. figures held up. In fact, the findings from France were slightly higher—with 37 percent of randomly selected respondents reporting executions.

SECRET BLOOD BATH

Three years of exhaustive research, conducted in seven cities and two countries, with more than 800 refugees interviewed, had finally provided persuasive evidence that a blood bath had occurred in Vietnam. "We shouldn't have been surprised, knowing what history tells us to regimes such as Hanoi's," says Jackson, now newly appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for East Asia and Pacific Affairs. "A lot of reasonable people doubted the reports from escapees of Nazi concentration camps." And Desbarats and Jackson note: "Governments, the media and the public often treat the absence of reports from closed societies as proof that something—like widespread killing—has not happened. It is not prudent to apply to any totalitarian society the same standards of proof we would apply in a free

¹ See "Ginetta Sagan: Heroine of Human Rights," Reader's Digest, April '85.

society, with a searching press and groups dedicated to disclosing the truth."

In a perverse way, the torture, hunger and degrading conditions of Vietnam's infamous re-education camps had actually drawn attention away from its "secret blood bath." The fear and cultural reticence of the Vietnamese refugees had also helped keep this slaughter in the shadows. But now, the research of these two scholars has directed a shaft of light into the darker recesses of this repressive and vengeful regime.

LEWIS LEHRMAN ON THE REAL MEANING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND THE RESTORATION OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the August 29, 1986 issue of *National Review* includes a brilliant essay by my good friend Lew Lehrman on the human rights issue of this century—the right to life. His essay argues that the issues of slavery and the rights to life are more than historically analogous—they are the same issue, and they represent the continuing challenge to the principles of our Constitution which guarantee to each individual the protection of their most fundamental God-given rights, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I commend this essay to the attention of my colleagues.

THE RIGHT TO LIFE AND THE RESTORATION OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC (Lewis E. Lehrman)

The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States inaugurated not only the American experiment, but also one of the great economic booms in history. Americans moved West and South, labored North and East to till the soil, build roads, finance banks, invest in new technologies, discover new methods of farming, mining, and manufacture. "We made the experiment," Lincoln wrote during the prosperity of 1854. In America "we proposed to give all a chance." Now "the fruit is before us. Look at it—think of it. Look at it in its aggregate grandeur, of extent of country and numbers of population—of ship and steamboat and rail."

In 1854, almost four score years had gone by since the Founding and nearly as many years divided the abject poverty of Thomas Lincoln from the prosperity of his son Abraham, the "lone Whig star" of Illinois. In twenty years of hard work before 1854, Lincoln had been preoccupied with personal advance in law and politics, during which time he had focused on the great issues of economic nationalism: the tariff, the National Bank, and internal improvements. It is true that he was only one among thousands of apostles of national development and economic growth; but he was utterly devoted to their cause.

In 1853, all America basked in the glow of a prosperity Americans took as their just deserts. The period stretching from the inauguration of James Monroe in 1817 through the early 1850s has gone down in American history as the Era of Good Feeling and of Manifest Destiny—an era during which, despite the great perils faced by the infant

nation at the turn of the century, America had conquered a continent and established her independence of Europe. The new nation had finally settled down.

Then, out of the Great Plains, the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 blew in upon American politics with the force of a tornado, sweeping aside the economic issues paramount in the immediate past. The old Whig Party disintegrated under the pressure of the new politics, and so, in all but name did the Old Democracy, the party of Jefferson and Jackson—both parties swept aside by the gale force of a single moral issue, or what our pundits today would call a social issue. That issue, the extension of slavery to the territories, led ineluctably to the great national debate over the "unalienable right to liberty" of the black slave. It was neither the first nor the last, but it was, up to that time, the greatest debate over the first principles of the American Republic.

At first, Americans—Democrats and Whigs alike—refused to believe that the work and wealth of recent decades, not to mention the pocketbook politics of the era, would be swallowed up in a moral struggle over a single issue. But, in opening all the Western lands to slaveholding, Kansas-Nebraska shattered the spirit of the Missouri Compromise of 1820, which had limited slavery to states south of 36°30'. If it were true, as Lincoln would later say, that eventually the nation must be all slave or all free, there could be little doubt in which direction the new act was taking us.

In the words of one distinguished historian of the period, Professor Gabor Borritt of Gettysburg College, Kansas-Nebraska shook national politics like Jefferson's "firebell in the night." So abrupt was the transition from preoccupation with economics and national security ("Manifest Destiny" and "Western Lands") that Abraham Lincoln, himself one of the most knowledgeable of Whig leaders on tax, tariff, and banking issues, abandoned further discussion of them. After 1854, he became almost mute on economic issues, claiming in the year he stood for President that "just now [tax, tariff, and financial affairs] cannot even obtain a hearing . . . for, whether we will or not, the question of slavery is the question, the all-absorbing topic of the day."

Today, six years after President Reagan's first victory, we are far along with economic expansion and just as far along with rebuilding our national defense. Financial markets have risen to new highs. Employment levels and new business formations have reached new peaks. In Libya and Grenada we have successfully, if ever so cautiously, tested our willingness once again to use force in defense of our national principles and interests. Politicians of both parties still speak as if they expect Americans, riding the wave of new prosperity at home and restored prestige abroad, to continue to focus on economic and defense issues as they have for a generation. As Vice President Bush declared in an interview in June, "Today, people vote their pocketbooks." We shall see.

For I believe that today the American people are prepared to put their pocketbooks back into their pockets. I believe that Americans once again are preparing to ask fundamental questions, about life and death, about our special purpose as a nation, and about the first principles and fundamental law by which, as a nation under God, we have dedicated ourselves to live. I believe that national politics during the late 1980s and the 1990s will be domi-

nated by the great constitutional, moral, and social issues of our time.

Chief among these issues will be the right to life. Thirteen years ago, in *Roe v. Wade*, the Supreme Court overthrew the common law of centuries and the statute law of fifty states, authorized abortion on demand, and thereby severed the child-about-to-be-born from the Declaration of Independence. It was in the Declaration, the organic law of the American Founding, that the Fathers of our country proclaimed the self-evident truths of our fundamental moral and constitutional law: that all men are created equal, and that all men are created by God with the unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It was this original charter of the nation that the Supreme Court violated in *Roe*, without even the mandate of an election or a vote in Congress.

Five thousand days and twenty million lives later, abortion on demand has buried a nation of children as big as the whole of Canada. But far from resolving the issue of the right to life, as the Justices intended, the Court has stirred up all America and ignited the moral tinder deep in the souls of our countrymen. The Court, by creating a great debate over our fundamental law and essential character as a people, has guaranteed that abortion will surely sweep away all more mundane political considerations.

I suggest not merely that the issues of slavery and abortion are historically analogous. Rather I say that they are, in a crucial sense, the same issue. Both are but particular cases of the recurring challenge to the first principles of the American Revolution, which forbid the violation of the God-given rights of any person, no matter how convenient such a violation might be for some powerful individual or faction, or even a majority.

In the normal course of our politics we do not experience this challenge in its starkest terms. Our fundamental law, our fundamental purpose as a nation is not fully articulated in the positive law by which we govern our daily affairs. The Declaration of Independence, in which our nation's fundamental principles are stated, is not phrased in such a way as to give perfect guidance to the resolution of everyday political disputes. In the normal course of events the American people are content to let the Declaration's unalienable rights be secured by the more intricate structure of the Constitution, which by the genius of the Founding Fathers transformed the play of political interests into a dynamic balance wheel of human and civil rights. Nevertheless, the Declaration gave birth to America as an independent nation and best expresses our ultimate reason for national being.

From time to time, our ordinary politics fails us in ways too dramatic to ignore. An impasse develops in the constitutional process. A weakness shows up in the architecture of liberty. Our positive law (including even the Constitution, or its interpreters) can fail in some critical way to uphold the first principles of our national Founding. It is at such times that it becomes necessary for Americans—who seem now, as they seemed in 1854, too concerned with progress and payrolls—to reconsider the organic law written in their hearts. It is then that American politics again becomes a struggle over the meaning of the Declaration of Independence.

In our time, most leading politicians and intellectuals argue that such philosophical struggles, turning ultimately on moral and

religious questions, should be excluded from American politics. With Senator Stephen Douglas, Lincoln's great opponent, who held that Kansas-Nebraska and the *Dred Scott* decision (1857) made the black man forever a slave in America, they hold that the Supreme Court can settle and has settled forever the abortion issue. They are content to accept, paraphrasing Judge Taney, that the child in the womb has no rights which Americans are bound to respect. They argue, with Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens, that only "secular interests" are fit subjects of national debate. Some even argue that the resurgence of religion and moral issues in American politics is but a passing fad, safely scorned by sophisticated pragmatists concerned with the weightier matters of wealth and weaponry.

These opinions are as unsurprising as they are unconvincing. What we hear rolling across the Potomac are the hollow, haunting echoes of the great slavery debates of the 1850s. For decades the battle over slavery had been stayed by the timely intervention of grave Whigs and eloquent Democrats who foresaw what passions would be loosed when men ceased to struggle for gain and ground and sought instead to live faithfully by the Divine standards Americans had set themselves in the Declaration. Webster and Clay, Calhoun and Douglas, prudently had sought to guide the energies of the people into economic growth and westward expansion, to mitigate, even to avoid the supervening moral and religious issues raised by the debate over slavery. The remarkable thing is how successful they were for so long in convincing Americans that slavery could be countenanced if its extent could be compromised.

But the insurgent noise would not be silenced. For the muffled murmur throughout the land was the sound of the slave, his tortured breathing rustling the pages of the Declaration of Independence, scaring up from the dry parchment the great truths placed there by Jefferson. For the needs of nation-building, for the sake of a union between slave and free states, slavery may have been legalized in the Constitution. But it was the Creator, as the Founders proclaimed in the Declaration, Who gave men the unalienable right to life and liberty. This contradiction, like a house divided, could not stand.

Just three years after the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the *Dred Scott* decision gave meaning to Lincoln's warnings; it declared the U.S., in effect, a slave nation. *Dred Scott* held that the black slave was not a person under the Constitution, and it made inviolate the property rights of slaveowners. In the very next election, the nation responded by choosing a President who had proclaimed *Dred Scott* unbinding as a "rule of political action" in virtue of the fundamental law of the Declaration and the power of Congress to prohibit slavery in the territories. Six hundred thousand men and boys, the flower of American youth, perished in a war over the meaning of a religious and moral principle—or, in the words of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic": "As He died to make men holy, we shall die to make men free."

There is then no need to be surprised that in the battle over *Roe v. Wade*—wherein we deal not only with life and liberty, as in *Dred Scott*, but with life and death—moderate men and women should wish to put the fundamental issues aside. There is no reason to be astonished that so many leading intellectuals wish to believe that the Supreme

Court has settled the matter. Nothing should be easier to understand than that the political, business, and academic establishments are embarrassed by the issue and affect to scorn those who raise it. After all, if the modern followers of Lincoln are right, no material bounty America bestows on her people or the world can excuse her crime. If the party of Lincoln is right, there is only one road to national redemption: to fight the evil of abortion until it is extinguished, a fight that may make the divisions of the 1960s, from which we are barely recovered, look like a family reunion.

One way of scorning the issue—one popular tune to whistle past the graveyard—is to deride abortion as a "single issue" pursued by fanatics to the detriment of the common good. Those who take this tack understand neither the issue nor their countrymen. The unalienable right to life is not for America, a single issue, but a first principle, a self-evident truth established at its Founding. Nothing is more striking about American history than our willingness to take principles of truth and right seriously. Americans know that neither blood, nor culture, nor even locality is what binds us together. Uniquely among nations we are bound together and defined by our founding principles. It is the pragmatic politicians of the pocketbook who do not know their countrymen.

July 4, 1776, was an event of worldwide significance, not because a new nation was founded on the shores of the Atlantic, but because a new nation, the very first of its kind, was founded "under God," begotten, as Thomas Jefferson wrote, according to the "Laws of Nature and of Nature's God," a nation dedicated, in fact, to a religious proposition, a principle of natural theology. Consider again the phrasing: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights," to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This proposition, the great Emancipator proclaimed, is "the Father of all moral principle" among Americans, the animating spirit of our laws. By reason of this founding principle, Lincoln called his countrymen "the almost chosen people"; and it was Jefferson himself who proposed that the national seal portray Moses leading the chosen people to the promised land.

The Founders' principles of equality and unalienable rights are characterized by their universality and claim to Divine sanction. The universality of the principles makes it clear that the Founders did not mean that all human beings are or ought to be equal in all respects—height, weight, beauty, wealth. They meant instead that no person has to another the relation God has to him: Thus the rights enumerated in the Declaration are God-given, and hence "unalienable." Neither the weight of tradition nor the exigencies of statecraft can rationalize the false claim that the unalienable rights of the Declaration are a gift of the state or of the people. As Professor Harry Jaffa would put it: No man has a natural right to rule over any other man, as God does over man; thus a man may rule over another, his equal, only with his consent. This is the essential meaning of our founding law. If there were ever any doubt that we are bound by it—and the Declaration is still put at the head of the statutes-at-large of the U.S. Code and described therein as organic law—Lincoln's testimony and the general assent given it by Americans then and later should have laid that doubt permanently to rest.

But while most Americans take the Declaration seriously, we do have a tendency to fix upon its assertions of equality and liberty, quickly passing over its guarantee of an unalienable right to life as if it were merely a glittering generality. The truth is that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are a logically ordered sequence. The rights to liberty and to the pursuit of happiness derive from every man's right to his own life and are meaningless without it.

Life precedes liberty in the words of the Declaration because liberty was made for life, not life for liberty. If the right to life is omitted, then liberty is a right contingent upon force and without moral substance, and the Declaration is a nullity. Moreover, it is by reason of the unalienable right to life that all men hold the right to the fruits of their labor. A free society dissolves into an absurdity if the right to life is denied.

Abortion, like slavery, allows equals to rule over equals without their consent, depriving the child in the womb not only of the right to liberty, but of the right to life as well. But there is a disputed point: Do unborn children hold these rights? There can be no denial that they have life and have had it from the very first moment of conception: That is true in medicine as in law. But what is more important is that, as our fundamental law affirms, they hold life as a gift of the Creator—Who "created" them "equal" and "endowed them" at creation "with certain unalienable rights"—from the moment of conception. Creation does not occur at the second trimester, or at the third, or at viability, but at the very beginning of life. The usual arguments about viability, intelligence, pain, quickening, meaningful life, or unwanted children are as irrelevant as earlier arguments, that the poor, black slaves were better off under the rule of a benevolent master. Under the Declaration, under the Divine and natural law by which we have promised to live, the child about to be born, no less than the black slave, holds rights unconditional upon the convenience of others, rights that cannot be altered because other men place a lesser value on the life of a child in the womb.

It is no use, in extenuation, to invoke the pluralism of opinions, or the absence of consensus, as if, in the struggle over *Roe v. Wade*, all disagreements were merely part of a friendly historical debate; as if no lives were at stake and there were no ultimate judge to whom to make an appeal. The organic law of the American nation and the Divine law prevail over all positive law, and thus over the litigious subtleties of politicians and judges.

Our task is easier than Lincoln's, and its strain on the country will be less. In the Constitution, Lincoln faced an explicit, it time-bound, sanction for slavery, which is lacking in the case of abortion. Each in its own time, slavery and abortion have masqueraded as the law of the land; and the abortion masquerade is utterly transparent. There is an inescapable absurdity in the Supreme Court's argument that the same Fourteenth Amendment that made the black slave a person can be used to deny the personhood of the child about to be born. In 1868, when the Fourteenth Amendment was passed, 28 of the 37 states held abortion to be a criminal act, even prior to quickening. (Over the next 15 years seven more states made abortion a crime. By the time of *Roe v. Wade*, in 1973, nearly all the states had criminalized abortion. There was a national consensus on abortion: that it is wrong.) In view of the near universality of the laws

against abortion at the time the Fourteenth Amendment was passed, there can be no doubt about its intent or the meaning of the amendment today. The Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade* had absolutely no basis, literal or implied, in the Fourteenth Amendment. If the Fourteenth Amendment calls for anything, it calls for reversal of *Roe v. Wade*.

Roe v. Wade may for now be a legal decision of the Supreme Court; but it is unlawful in the full sense of the word. It is without any identifiable source of authority in constitutional law. In the light of logic, the moral law, and American history, *Roe v. Wade* is absurd; it comes to just nothing—nothing but “raw judicial power.” It requires no irreverence for the letter or the spirit of the Constitution to declare that the decision must be overturned, by a subsequent Supreme Court decision if possible, but if not, then by constitutional amendment or congressional act. There is in the *Federalist Papers*, the original handbook of constitutional interpretation, a clear warrant for such a rebuke of the Court. *Federalist* Number 81 declares that if judicial “misconstructions and contraventions of the will of the Legislature” do create constitutional defects, there is a constitutional remedy. Even if the legislature cannot “reverse a [judicial] determination once made, in a particular case,” it can “prescribe a new rule for future cases.” Above all, and despite recent judicial imperialism, the three branches of the Federal Government are co-equal, and all subordinate to “the people” who “ordained” the Constitution to fulfill the promises of the Declaration.

Yet this argument does not end the debate. For the ultimate charge against those who would push the right to life to the top of our political agenda is that they are mixing religion and politics, trying to impose a single set of religious values on the nation. But the link between religion and American politics is indissoluble, for, at the very beginning, in the Declaration, the nation was founded upon the principles of natural religion; it would collapse without them. Jefferson himself, often falsely described as a completely secular man, acknowledged this link, writing that “The God Who gave us life, gave us liberty . . . Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God?”

Those who fear the intrusion of religion into politics are not all wrong. We have been well served by the consensus that excludes sectarian passions from ordinary political disputes. But when fellow Americans of good will ask us to grow quiet on the painful but fundamental issues of abortion, prayer, or pornography, for fear of starting a divisive debate over religious and moral principles, they make a rule of thumb into a rule of life. The truth is not that religion never belongs in American politics. The truth is instead, as Lincoln argued, that religion belongs in American politics only when our politics have been forced back upon first principles.

By nature Lincoln was as much politician as prophet. He was a moderate and judicious man, certainly not inclined to fanaticism. Neither was he a natural candidate for a martyr's crown. But when the crucial issue was joined, Lincoln exposed the counsels of moderation for the well-meaning sophistries they were. And he died a martyr.

Some of us, dreading the great moral conflict Lincoln faced, might have sided with Douglas. But now, more than a century later, who laments the reversal of *Dred*

Scott or would rewrite history to keep the slave in chains? Who now holds up the memory of Chief Justice Taney for the honor of the ages? Who now wishes that Lincoln had used the Court's decision as an excuse to turn to other matters? Who can forget what Lincoln, against all polite opinion, and borne up by his faith in a just God, did for free men?

We know it intuitively. It is the Declaration's principles and Lincoln's example we must follow. Certainly not to violence. There will be no need, for, as I said at the outset, the law to which we appeal is inscribed on the hearts of all Americans, more deeply now than ever. The abyss of civil war does not lie before us. If we fail, we will have been overcome by nothing but false opinion and the petty demon of polite society—because we are afraid of the elite consensus and the inelegance of moral commitment, afraid to take on the establishment by naming the national sin, unwilling to bear witness to first principles while the party of prosperity is going so well. But to name these considerations is to know how shameful it is to hold back. We must be bold; so that for now and for all time to come, the unalienable rights to life and liberty, the promises of the Declaration of Independence, shall not perish from this earth.

AN EDITOR SPEAKS OUT

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, while there are a number of important issues that face the Congress in the next few weeks and most certainly next year, few compare to the need to bring the deficit under control. This point is driven home in an editorial that appeared recently in one of the daily newspapers in my congressional district.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the editorial, “Presidential Priority,” that appeared in the August 26, 1986, edition of the Norfolk Daily News:

PRESIDENTIAL PRIORITY

Donald T. Regan, White House chief of staff, hopes his boss can provide a major push for overhauling the federal budget system during his last two years in office. As he explained in an interview last week, many of the budget practices at the federal level “would be considered dishonest and illegal if done in the private sector.” He was referring to trust funds that are mingled with ordinary receipts. He could have mentioned, too, the now time-honored practice of simply spending money that has not yet been printed.

Mr. Regan sees the answers in a variety of measures. Among them: Biennial instead of one-year budgets, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, line-item veto power for the president, creation of a separate capital budget for construction projects and the removal of trust funds (Social Security is one) from the general treasury.

The proposals stemmed from staff considerations of what should be President Reagan's No. 1 domestic concern for the remainder of his term. Mr. Regan said the fight against drug abuse would be given the sort of priority status in these next two years that tax revision received earlier.

Serious as the drug problem is, Mr. Reagan and his White House staffers ought to be reminded that, like all crime problems, states and local governments figure so largely in the solution that federal money and federal personnel will not supply the solution. Washington can only help effectively to a limited extent, and in protecting borders against traffickers. Presidential attention, yes, but a priority to the exclusion of budget control, no.

With a tax system revised—for the better, we believe—and inflation under control, the major remaining problem which demands urgent attention is the deficit. You can attack deficit problems only through budgetary control. That deserves the top priority. It is a problem that also demands constructive congressional attention—the sort provided in the intense effort to arrive at the new tax bill.

The time has come to put the deficit No. 1 on the Reagan hit list.

THE PERES-MUBARAK SUMMIT: NEGOTIATIONS WORK IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Prime Minister Peres of Israel and President Mubarak of Egypt, who met today in Alexandria, Egypt, for the first time since Mubarak became President of Egypt. It is also the first summit between the heads of state of Egypt and Israel in 5 years.

I know that all of my colleagues agree with me that this is an historic meeting, and hope as I do that it will usher in a new era both in Egyptian-Israeli relations and in the search for a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. The meeting is the result of arduous negotiations between Egypt and Israel over a broad series of issues, and proves the difficulty of securing and maintaining peace in this region. I think that these negotiations prove once and for all to those of use naive enough to believe that the peace treaty signed at Camp David would be easy to implement, that peace in the Middle East is a process that we must continue to work on.

In taking note of this occasion, I believe that it is important that we note the strong and important support of the administration for the negotiating process between Egypt and Israel. The role of the executive branch, and in particular of the Assistant Secretary for Near East and South Asia, Richard Murphy, was critical to the negotiations leading up to this summit. Murphy has for the last several days traveled back and forth in the region to ensure that agreement was reached. The administration is to be applauded for its willingness to put out this kind of effort in support of peace.

I believe that these negotiations have shown again, to those of us who didn't already know it, that the United States is a necessary element in the Middle East equation, and that peace can only come with direct and forceful U.S. participation. The timeconsuming and sometimes disheartening work which Assistant Secretary Murphy undertook is precise-

ly the kind of effort which must be undertaken in order to promote peace in this troubled region, and especially the search for a comprehensive peace agreement.

In recent months, this kind of active support for the broader peace process simply has not been forthcoming. The Administration has urged the parties to move, but has generally sat back and waited rather than take an active stand in their search. I believe that this must change if we are to make any real progress in this region and in solving this crisis. The same commitment by the United States, except on a greater scale is needed if the broader peace process is truly to move forward. The issues between Egypt and Israel were relatively easy when compared to the broader regional issues: the future of the West Bank and Gaza, the security of Israel's borders, the rights of the Palestinians. Progress on these issues is only possible if the U.S. Government puts its strongest effort into the search for peace.

Mr. President, I want to again applaud the efforts of Prime Minister Peres and President Mubarak, and to extend to them the fullest possible support and encouragement of the United States.

I also urge the executive branch to search creatively for new ways in which it can move ahead to promote the broader peace process, so that some day we can take note of a summit between an Israeli Prime Minister and another Arab head of state who has signed a peace agreement with Israel.

EFFECT OF ANTIAPARTHEID LEGISLATION

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article published in today's Los Angeles Times. It was written by Mr. Gerald Warburg, an adviser to Senator ALAN CRANSTON on foreign policy, defense, and trade matters. In his article, Mr. Warburg reviews the issue of preemption and the intention of the Senate in that regard. He points out that the Senate version of antiapartheid legislation, which was approved by this body today, was drafted by more than a half-dozen Senators, many of whom utterly reject Senator LUGAR's interpretation of preemption.

In approving today's legislation, this body clearly stated its intention that the legislation will not preempt or supersede any local or State antiapartheid laws. I believe my colleagues would be interested to learn that many of our colleagues in the other body agree with us on this important matter.

Again, I commend this article to my colleagues.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 12, 1986]

DIVESTITURE WILL SURVIVE (By Gerald Warburg)

Will the South Africa sanctions legislation pending in Congress undermine California's new anti-apartheid law? Can federal authorities require local governments to profit from apartheid against their will?

The answer to both vexing questions is yes, according to proponents of a sweeping federal preemption doctrine recently advanced by Sen. Richard G. Lugar (R-Ind.).

The specter that enacting the pending congressional measure on anti-apartheid trade sanctions would strike down broader state divestiture legislation has alarmed grass-roots activists. At stake is the fate of as many as 20 state statutes and more than 80 city and county regulations that address the South Africa issue.

There is valid reason for concern when one hears the views of Lugar, the respected Foreign Relations Committee chairman: "When we get into anti-apartheid law, the federal government is speaking for the nation . . . we cannot have individual states and cities establishing their own foreign policies."

Lugar rests his case on the presumptive constitutional grant of federal supremacy in international affairs, and concludes that any federal legislation on South Africa—no matter how limited its scope—preempts all state legislation on the matter.

But before the activists' concern turns to panic, the full record needs to be scrutinized. There is no reason for California to back away from the strong measures adopted in Sacramento. Lugar's is a minority opinion—one unlikely to prevail if pressed in a legal challenge.

"When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean," says the Queen in "Alice In Wonderland." So it often is with lawmakers struggling to place their own interpretation on legislation during the drafting process. Lugar currently is advancing his own preemption thesis as a selling point to persuade the White House and corporate leaders to live with the Senate bill, which Lugar maintains would at least get local authorities off their backs on the emotionally charged South Africa issue.

Yet the "Lugar bill" actually is a cut-and-paste job of legislation drafted by a half-dozen senators. These co-authors utterly rejected Lugar's interpretation, as the following statements culled from the long and tortured legislative history of the South Africa debate illustrate.

William Proxmire of Wisconsin, senior Democrat on the Banking Committee: "We have no intention of preempting state divestment law."

Alan Cranston of California, Democratic floor manager of the measure: "Courts always recognize the distinction between the state as market participant and the state as a market regulator . . . we have no intention of compelling sovereign states to invest in companies that they do not wish to invest in."

Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, senior Democrat on the Judiciary Committee: "The law is clear that this legislation will not preempt the kind of state and local action against apartheid that has occurred throughout this country."

Advocates of total preemption make much of a vote last month against an amendment by Sen. Alfonse M. D'Amato (R-N.Y.). But this amendment pertained only to a special contracting issue (whereby federal funds for New York City might be withheld if local authorities, acting against companies still in South Africa, ignored U.S. civil-rights and budget laws requiring acceptance of low-bid contracts). D'Amato said explicitly that this debate "had nothing to do with divestiture."

Those who wish that the federal legislation explicitly preempted local divestiture have failed to win their point in the con-

gressional debate. The only effort to legislate a total ban on state laws pertaining to South Africa, an amendment introduced by Sen. William V. Roth Jr. (R-Del.), was withdrawn in the face of very strong opposition. The final legislative product has no substantive provisions whatsoever on preemption. And it is totally silent on the divestiture issue. Thus it is grasping at straws to maintain, as Lugar has, that the bill "occupies the field" on all South Africa-related matters.

While Lugar is correct that the Constitution yields supremacy to Washington in conducting foreign relations, the Supreme Court has defended repeatedly the right of states to manage their own funds—even if their trusteeship involves choices affecting international affairs.

As is often the case, Washington lawmakers have followed, not led, local governments, churches and university activists in addressing the South Africa issue. The federal courts are unlikely to sustain an illogical assertion that congressional action, which imposes trade sanctions but is silent on divestiture and preemption, could force states to keep their IBM stock. Yet, because of the stir created by Lugar's assertions, proponents of sanctions will move to enact new provisions that would make the case for total preemption legally untenable.

The bottom line is that local authorities already have a clear legal right (and moral obligation) to exercise discretion in how they invest their money. While a minority may wish that the emerging federal law would immobilize grass-roots action, wishing isn't going to make it so.

THE VILLAGE OF THE LIVING DEAD

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, next week we are likely to revisit the debate on assistance to the freedom forces in Angola. Fourteen months after Congress repealed the Clark amendment, section 107 of the Intelligence Authorization Act of 1986 would have us again place the same "country specific restriction" on the conduct of U.S. foreign policy in Africa.

Once again, liberal Members of Congress seek to tie the hands of the President of the United States. Simply stated section 107 takes away the President's authority to assist anti-Communist forces in Angola through covert means. U.S. foreign policy objectives are not always best conducted under public scrutiny or with public debate. How successful would our attack against Libya have been if we had held public hearings over the correctness of that direct military action? How many lives would have been needlessly lost? Public debate is an important right of Americans, but it must be balanced with the President's constitutional duty to manage the foreign policy of the United States.

The most distressing point I must make is that this bill reinforces a naive assumption that the United States must conduct all aspects of its foreign policy in public. Why do we continually feel the need to question the mo-

tives of the President of the United States? Isn't it time to reaffirm our trust in our forefather's drafting of the Constitution and stop these attempts to cross over the dividing line between the constitutional power of the President to conduct an effective foreign policy?

With the repeal of the Clark amendment, on July 10, 1985, one of the last vestiges of the Vietnam syndrome was removed from the books. Although the drafters of the original Clark amendment hoped that the opposition forces to the Communist regime would falter without U.S. assistance, the pro-Western forces of Jonas Savimbi have struggled on for 10 years. Today President Savimbi's UNITA forces control a substantial portion of the Angolan countryside and enjoy broad popular support north to south of that huge country. The area under their control is well managed and free. But these areas come under regular attack by Soviet and Cuban manned aircraft and tanks.

The freedom forces of UNITA have been fortunate in that, even without United States help, they have held their own against superior, Soviet equipped, Cuban trained forces. This is underscored by the major Communist offensive, with direct Soviet and Cuban assistance, direction and participation that was launched against UNITA this past year. The UNITA forces not only held on, but managed to repel the Communist forces.

Moreover, the Communist forces do not confine their attacks on the freedom forces of Jonas Savimbi, or others fighting to bring an end of tyranny to their country. Rather, as in Afghanistan, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Nicaragua the Communist controlled Government terrorizes innocent citizens throughout the countryside. As a former Cuban member of Castro's expeditionary forces in Angola explained, "any village more than 10 kilometers outside the town we were attacking was automatically considered to favor UNITA and was therefore subject to punitive measures." Orders were, "Destroy everything, burn down the houses, kill the cattle, neutralize the population." Those unfortunate innocent Angolans, living at the capricious whim of the Luanda government, are indeed inhabiting villages of the living dead.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the following article from the American Spectator that documents the atrocities committed by the Communist government in Angola against its own people in areas that the Communist government itself controls. After reading this nightmarish account how can any Member of Congress not repeal section 107 of the Intelligence Authorization Act of 1986.

[From the American Spectator, August 1986]

THE VILLAGE OF THE LIVING DEAD
(By Nicholas Rowe)

I was in Angola earlier this year with a Canadian news team. Outside Jamba, the provisional capital of rebel leader Jonas Savimbi's UNITA movement, is a small village housing refugee women from the regions under the control of the Luanda Communist regime. It is known as "the village of the living dead." Some of the women are mutilated, others have lost their mind, all are victims of Soviet-inspired barbarism. And yet they speak of themselves as the lucky ones; they have survived.

Through our interpreter we spoke to some of the women able and willing to recount their experiences. The first was Madalena Nguve, who looked much older than her forty-five years:

"It was the second of November 1984 when the Cubans came to our village. I tried to stop them taking away my son. He was twelve, and from the age of ten and upwards they come and ship them off to Cuba. I tried to stop them but one of the Cubans cut off my arm with a bayonet. They were beating the children who didn't want to leave their parents, beating them with the butt ends of their rifles. So, while I was bleeding, they took away my son. He was my only child. I've had no contact with him since that day."

Severina Chilombo, arms crossed tight over her stomach, rocked compulsively back and forth as she told us her story:

"The Cubans arrived at my village just at daybreak. They locked some of the people into the huts and burned them alive. Others, their limbs—arms and legs—were cut off. My father burned to death in one of the huts, also my uncle. They poured gasoline on the huts and with torches they lit the fires. They ripped the baby I was carrying off my back. They swung and smashed her against a tree. She died, her little head cracked open. I was pushed into a lorry with some of the other younger women and boys. Later they stopped. I was raped the first time by ten men. We were raped in front of the boys deliberately. The Cubans said to them, 'Look how we rape your mothers and sisters so they can't have any more children.' During the journey we could choose whether we wanted sex voluntarily or not. Those who resisted were stabbed by bayonets. Then they were raped. Then they were killed. At the end of the journey the boys were taken away and the women put into prison. We weren't allowed to wash or anything for the first seven days. But every day the Cubans came and . . . and . . . violated us. I lost my father and my mother. Everybody. There are days when I don't have any more tears left to cry. Today is almost one of those days. It was my first baby. My only baby."

Veronica Kahali was concerned that we would not believe her. She kept repeating to our interpreter, "I am not inventing a story, I saw what I saw with my own eyes." She would point to her companions in distress. "They know I am telling the truth. . . . We have all seen so much, been through so much." Reassured that we did not doubt her and that our tape-recorder would capture every word, she began in a flat, emotionless voice, as if memory of her Calvary would be erased by its telling:

"When the Cubans arrived at my village, all the people were rounded up. The older people were killed, the younger ones taken away, the boys to the army. The young women were separated from the men and taken to prison." Almost as an afterthought, she added, "The pregnant women in prison were killed by having their bellies cut open. The Cubans cut open the pregnant women by bayoneting them from just below the breast downwards."

There was an involuntary gasp of horror from our interpreter, herself a mother. Veronica Kahali was again immediately on the defensive. "But I saw it! My sister was close to her time and her belly was ripped open. She died next to her unborn baby. I saw it!"

Once calmed, she resumed her monotone monologue:

"Our people were sorted out into groups: old men, young men, old women, young

women, children. The old men were killed right there on the spot. The children who gave problems were beaten to death with rifle butts . . . anything . . . hacked with choppers, pangas. The group of girls I was in, the Cubans and Fapla [soldiers of the Angolan Communist army] came very day. . . . five of them sometimes. They chose a woman and took her out of the cells. I was raped continuously. They had no mercy. If you screamed or made any noise they just gagged your mouth and held you down. Of course some of the women cried. That made it worse for them. They were beaten up and then, afterwards, they were killed."

Angelina Missoji was much more emotional; anxious that we should hear her story but ashamed of her part in it:

"It was a very sad morning. The people were walking down to the fields, it was harvest time. We walked into an ambush laid by the Cubans and some Fapla soldiers. When we fell into this ambush, I tried to run away but I was shot in my foot. Later I was taken away by the Cubans. The bone in my foot was not shattered by the bullet, but in prison the bottom part of my leg was amputated anyway."

At first undecided whether to display her mutilation or to conceal it, she finally tucked her truncated leg under the wooden bench where she was hunched.

"The villagers were divided into groups. The very old people were killed immediately, other old women taken to prison to work there. The younger women were raped and the young men sent for military training. I saw with my own eyes two different ways of killing the old. Some were lined up and shot. Others who were very old were simply clubbed to death, or kicked to death with boots or bayoneted. Both my mother and father were killed by the Cubans. I was there, I saw it. Both were killed in more or less the same way. First they were clubbed and then shot. I was very sad and also angry with myself that I did nothing, said nothing. But I would have been killed as well. I was afraid. It is very difficult for me to remember these things. No, I can't talk any more about this. I'm sorry. Forgive me."

The question we all asked ourselves was why: why attack these villages deep inside the part of Angola nominally controlled by José Eduardo Dos Santos and his Cuban allies? The answer came from an unexpected source, a Cuban who deserted to join UNITA. Miguel Garcia Enamorado, from the Cuban province of Gran Ma, explained that any village more than ten kilometers outside a town was automatically considered to favor UNITA and was therefore subject to punitive measures, "*pour encourager les autres*." Orders were, "Destroy everything, burn down the houses, kill the cattle, neutralize the population."

The above testimony makes me think that if Jonas Savimbi and UNITA lose their war, the village of the living dead may become the country of the living dead.

H.R. 5484, THE OMNIBUS DRUG ACT OF 1986

HON. ARLAN STANGELAND
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, we have just considered H.R. 5484, the Omnibus Drug

Act of 1986. As an original cosponsor of the bill, I am pleased it passed overwhelmingly.

I have long been concerned over this issue.

The easy access to illegal drugs and significant use by Americans demonstrate the validity of taking harsh steps to escalate the war against drugs.

It is my feeling that statistics on the availability and use of drugs in the past several years explain the problem. For instance, estimates indicate that 150 tons of cocaine—including large quantities of "crack," a relatively new, particularly potent free baser form that can be smoked—will enter the United States this year, compared to 85 tons in 1984. In addition to cocaine, 12 tons of heroin, between 30,000 and 60,000 tons of marijuana, and 200 tons of hashish will cross U.S. borders this year. Despite increased interdiction efforts, enforcement officials intercept only 10 percent to 15 percent of the drugs which enter this country each year.

Matching the escalating supply of drugs is an equally disturbing rise in demand. Americans spend an estimated \$120 billion annually on illicit drugs. Figures for 1985 show that 5 million Americans use cocaine regularly, with 1.2 million addicted and requiring treatment. Approximately 7 million abuse psychotropic drugs and 550,000 suffer from heroin addiction. However, the most troubling statistics emerged from a 1985 high school senior survey which revealed that almost two-thirds of those questioned have used illicit drugs—54 percent reported using marijuana/hashish, 18 percent inhalants, 12 percent sedatives, and 12 percent tranquilizers.

Our legislation—H.R. 5484—generally takes steps in five areas to help attack the drug problem.

First, the bill establishes educational programs to teach Americans, especially our young, the effects and problems associated with drug use. Also, drug treatment and prevention centers will be built.

Second, H.R. 5484 increases penalties for drug offenders in the following fashions. It establishes a minimum mandatory 5- and 10-year prison terms for new categories of offenders in major drug trafficking and serious drug trafficking. It provides an automatic sentence of life imprisonment without parole for a second conviction of an adult who sells a dangerous drug to a child or near a schoolyard. H.R. 5484 makes possible a sentence of death for anyone who commits murder while involved in a continuing criminal narcotics enterprise. And, there are provisions creating new crimes of money laundering, designer-drug trafficking, and using children to manufacture or distribute drugs.

Third, the measure will allow for more enforcement of current statutes by providing over \$100 million for more Drug Enforcement Agency [DEA] personnel, U.S. attorneys, and U.S. marshals. Because increased enforcement will mean more prisoners, authorizations are provided to build new prisons.

Fourth, the proposal expands the opportunity for interdiction—generally the seizure of smuggled drugs—as over \$200 million will be authorized from the existing fiscal year 1987 Department of Defense appropriations for procurement of equipment, such as certain radar, designed to detect and combat drug traffick-

ing on U.S. borders. Also, more Coast Guard personnel will be available for drug-interdiction efforts, and Coast Guard personnel will be assigned to Navy ships to make arrests.

Fifth, opportunities to eradicate—to destroy drug plants—will be increased as the President will be required to deny trade benefits to countries which do not cooperate in eradication efforts. Also, U.S. officials will be allowed greater involvement in overseas narcotics raids. In addition, our bill requires drug-producing countries to establish eradication programs as a condition of U.S. support for multilateral development bank aid.

This is truly comprehensive legislation. However, Federal Government intervention is not the entire answer. The challenge is so enormous it will never be fully met without significant private and business assistance. Therefore, it is important that Americans obtain the resolve necessary to overcome this menace. For until we do, more lives will be lost, dreams shattered, and normally admirable citizens will turn to crime out of a despicable dependency.

A SPECIAL PRAYER BY JAMES D. LOY

HON. ROD CHANDLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a very special prayer that I received from one of my constituents. It was written by a gentleman from Federal Way, WA, Mr. James D. Loy, who on September 2, 1986, lost his long fought battle against a malignant brain tumor. Yet, through his trials and pain, his faith endured. And it is symbolized in this simple prayer, which he wrote. "With love, humbleness, and meager understanding we acknowledge our domain. Universal forces and laws prevail. With available talents and energy we seek knowledge of the universal phenomena to be used for positive creative utilization and extension of this domain." Mr. Loy's wife, Doris, sent me this prayer and I would like to share it with my colleagues, taking a moment from our day to pay tribute to one man's spiritual path and the universal message it holds for us all.

MESSRS. PEPPER AND FASCELL SUPPORT FREEDOM IN ANGOLA

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, Congressmen CLAUDE PEPPER and DANTE FASCELL show the way for a responsible, bipartisan policy to meet the Communist challenge in Angola by opposing section 107 of the intelligence authorization bill (H.R. 4759). Section 107 eliminates any possibility of covert support to the freedom fighters in Angola. I urge my colleagues to stand with these two leaders of the House in support of the motion to strike section 107 of the intelligence authorization bill when it is considered on the House floor.

I urge my colleagues to read the Pepper-Fascell "Dear Colleague" letter on Angola.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 8, 1986.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We are writing to again ask your assistance in a matter of vital concern to United States foreign policy and security interests.

The House soon will consider H.R. 4759, the Intelligence Authorization Act of 1987. Section 107 of that bill reverses the House position on the "Clark Amendment" decided only last year, by a vote of 236 to 185. The repeal of the Clark Amendment eventually became law. We seek your continued support to sustain the important policy victory we achieved then by asking that you vote with me to delete section 107 from the bill.

Under section 107 of the Intelligence Authorization Act, Congress would reinstate the Clark Amendment. The 1976 Amendment, modified slightly in 1980, singled out Angola as the only foreign country in the world where no covert assistance of any kind could be provided. Instead, under section 107 and the Clark Amendment, the Congress must first pass a joint resolution, publicly specifying in detail all assistance given and identifying the recipients, before any aid may be given.

In 1976, the Clark Amendment had a plausible justification that it lacks now. Then, it was expected that Angola would sort out its own affairs, following its 1975 independence from Portugal, free from superpower entanglements—provided the U.S. demonstrated restraint. A permanent legislative prohibition against any covert assistance was intended to provide the Soviet Union with sufficient incentives to also show restraint.

Our calculations proved sadly wrong. Instead, the Soviet Union exploited this unique loophole by pouring in military assistance on behalf of a Marxist faction with little popular support. The Soviet intervention worked, and the MPLA quickly broke their promises to hold free elections. And in the process they snuffed out Angola's best chance for liberty.

With your support on July 10, 1985, we finally admitted our error by repealing the Clark Amendment. However, its supporters want it reinstated and have invented a new rationale for adoption. Because reports have surfaced that Angolan freedom fighters, led by UNITA's Jonas Savimbi, have received U.S. military assistance, they claim our support is no longer covert. Apparently, since some covert Angolan activities have been leaked and made public, any future activities should, in their view, also be made public.

Revealing in advance our intentions, as section 107 demands, will erode our prospects to bring freedom to Angola for several reasons.

First, it provides valuable information to the MPLA. They will learn in advance the nature and amount of any assistance provided, making it easier to develop counter-measures.

Second, it discourages other nations and groups who are discreetly giving to UNITA from continuing to do so by increasing the potential political cost if their role in backing the U.S. and UNITA is revealed.

Third, it encourages the Soviet Union to increase further its level of support out of fear of losing face in view of a publicly acknowledged military challenge to their communist allies.

A corollary argument used by Clark Amendment supporters claims that the South African government also wants UNITA to win. Therefore, we should not take steps to help UNITA because we will also somehow help the South African government in the process.

We believe this argument is wrong for two reasons. First, it says the Angolan people must be denied liberty because of the sins of an ally they cannot control. And secondly, it says that we must reflexively oppose every action the racist South African government makes. Under this logic, we should stop helping starvation victims in Ethiopia because South Africa is also donating aid. We believe that it would be a mistake to deny assistance to Angolan freedom fighters based solely on this guilt by association. In this instance, the South Africans are right; UNITA deserves our support. This same point was made by Winston Churchill years ago when he claimed, "I would accept help from the devil if he joined us in fighting Hitler."

We look forward to your continued support and ask that you join us in deleting section 107 from the Intelligence Authorization Act.

Kindest regards, and
Always Sincerely,

DANTE FASCELL,
Member of Congress.
CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress.

DISTRESS CALL HOAXES

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, week in and week out, the personnel of the U.S. Coast Guard strive to make American waters as safe as humanly possible. From time to time, however, these valuable and often courageous search-and-rescue efforts are abused by persons who make false distress calls. These false alarms divert the Coast Guard's limited resources and unnecessarily put Coast Guardsmen and women at risk.

In this context, I would like to insert into today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the September 11, 1986, Quincy Patriot Ledger in Massachusetts:

DISTRESS CALL HOAXES

In the past 12 months, the men and women of the Coast Guard district headquartered in Boston have saved 232 lives. During the same period, 48 people have lost their lives in First District seas off Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Rhode Island. The Coast Guard's rescue mission is very serious business.

But a few times a year, someone decides that it would be amusing to interfere with that mission. A phony distress call gets made—and the Coast Guard responds in force.

That's what happened on March 20—a cold, windy, icy day. A call came in for a sinking yacht with 10 people aboard. Three Coast Guard patrol boats, a jet, a helicopter and a tug were dispatched to find and help the "Lady Blue."

There was no Lady Blue, the call was a hoax. Coast Guardsmen risked their lives needlessly. Rescue boats and aircraft were

spread out over 9,100 miles of New England ocean on a bad-weather day when they well might have had a real emergency to respond to.

In dollars, the price of the intensive 20-hour search amounted to \$77,900. That's what it cost the Coast Guard.

For Norman Miller, 18, of Chelsea, the cost is also high. He was sentenced last week in federal court to a year in prison after admitting he made the phony distress call.

If Miller had been tried by the Coast Guardsmen he endangered, or by the fishermen whose safety net he jeopardized, the sentence might have been even tougher. The hoax call "is a terribly dangerous thing," Judge John J. McNaught said. "I hope other people understand that."

The one year in prison should help get the judge's message through.

INSIDE A MIND JAIL

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, all citizens of the United States are justifiably outraged by the obvious frameup and subsequent jailing of U.S. News & World Report Correspondent Nicolas Daniloff. However, the truth is that thousands of Soviet citizens are regularly subjected to the horrors now visited upon Nick Daniloff as he languishes as a hostage in Lefortovo Prison. So when something like the Daniloff outrage occurs, the last thing Americans should be is surprised, and yet so many of us are.

I therefore believe that now it is an especially appropriate time to submit for the historical RECORD the following article that appeared in Newsweek magazine outlining the incarceration in a so-called psychiatric institution of Serafim Yevsyukov, a man whose only crime is that he wants to leave the Soviet Union. It is a particularly tragic story, and one that screams out to be told.

Mr. Speaker, when Nick Daniloff is finally released, as I am sure he soon will be, it is critical that we in the free world remember that for every Nick Daniloff freed, there are thousands of Serafim Yevsyukovs still prisoners of the brutal Soviet system of injustice.

The article follows:

[From Newsweek Magazine, Aug. 11, 1986]

INSIDE A MIND JAIL—A SOVIET DISSIDENT GETS THE TREATMENT AT A MENTAL HOSPITAL IN MOSCOW

(By Joyce Barnathan, Moscow Bureau of Chief)

The shabby white building is nearly hidden by an imposing wall on a quiet back street in Moscow. Only the horizontal bars on its windows set it apart. A sign marks the single public entrance in the wall: Central Moscow Provincial Clinical Psychiatric Hospital. A muddy path leads past a construction site, some ambulances and garages. In front of the building sit women of all ages. Many wear hospital gowns. Some stare into space listlessly. Others chat. Inside, among the mentally ill, is 53-year-old Serafim Yevsyukov, a little-known Soviet dissident. Like many others who have undergone psychiatric "treatment" in the Soviet Union, he is quite sane.

He sits in self-imposed silence in his room on the all-male third floor. Two beefy women guard the entrance to the floor. There are no doorknobs in the building; nurses carry them in their pockets so they can lock patients into their rooms more easily. Institutional green walls make a gloomy backdrop for the few patients permitted to sit in the corridor during visiting hours. When his daughter, Lyudmila, 25, arrived recently for one of her daily visits, Yevsyukov was hunched over on a ratty couch in the corner.

"How do you feel, Papa?" Lyudmila asked, full of respect.

"I feel tired," he said, speaking sluggishly. "The injections make you want to do nothing, to think about nothing. I am always tired."

While Mikhail Gorbachev courts the West over arms control and the superpowers mark the 11th anniversary of the Helsinki accords, the Yevsyukov case demonstrates the Soviet Union's continued callousness toward human rights. Yevsyukov is a former Aeroflot navigator who, during the Khrushchev era, had traveled abroad, occasionally even to the West. In 1978 he quit his job and filed a petition to emigrate. Two years later he lost his subsequent job as an airport engineer. His case is not one that would draw much attention. He is not Jewish. He is not a political activist. He has no relatives in the West. He and his family simply have decided they want no part of their country and would prefer to leave.

He was picked up on his way to a weekly family protest against the imprisonment of his 24-year-old son, also named Serafim. The young man had already served a 2½-year sentence in Siberia for draft evasion; he refused to serve in the military of a country he demanded to leave. After his release Serafim again refused to serve, and he was sentenced to another three years. Once a week his father, mother and sister would protest by standing in front of the Pushkin monument in downtown Moscow, wearing badges with young Serafim's name on them. The protest drew some modest attention when the family's plight was featured in a broadcast by Radio Liberty in May. Last month KGB agents arrested Yevsyukov at a railway station en route to the monument. First they took him to a militia station and used a razor blade to rip his son's prison name tag from Yevsyukov's shirt. Then they moved him to the hospital. It took his family two days to find out where he was being kept.

Word of honor: It was the third time that Yevsyukov had been taken before psychiatrists. He was picked up by the police in June as he awaited the return from the United States of Soviet dissident Yelena Bonner at Moscow's Sheremetyevo airport. According to Lyudmila, he was taken to a militia office where a psychiatrist pronounced him sane. Earlier, in April 1985, his request for an exit visa brought him three days at the Central Psychiatric Hospital. First a bureaucrat had assured him that a visa would be granted if he obtained an invitation from the Dutch Embassy. When Yevsyukov protested that access to the embassy was blocked by militia guards, the bureaucrat gave him his "honest party word" that his entry would be permitted. Then, when he showed up at the embassy, he was hauled away to the mental hospital.

This time around Yevsyukov was sharing a room with 13 others, all of them mentally ill, when his daughter made her visit. His wife did not go because she always wears

her son's name tag—and suspects that she, too, will be locked up or questioned if she pays a call. Half a dozen roommates sprawled out on narrow beds, never uttering a sound. The barred windows in the barren room were closed on a warm summer's day. The patients are shaved twice a week; Yevsyukov sported a day-old beard. According to Lyudmila, her father had not been permitted to shower or receive fresh bed linen or clothes for 10 days. Forbidden to wear civilian clothes, he had on white cotton pajamas and a stained dark brown robe. He was not wearing his glasses because glass is forbidden in the hospital. He had no appetite for the kasha and cabbage soup served to him—nor for the fresh apricots his daughter had brought.

Getting rough: A male санитар (orderly) keeps close tabs on Yevsyukov's limited movements. Pale, blond and hulking, the санитар sits on a chair facing the special-security room, where Yevsyukov resides. He always positions himself to be directly across from Yevsyukov's bed. "He will not let me exercise, even in bed," Yevsyukov whispers. The санитар is sitting just five feet away, only barely out of earshot. "He will not let me sit on the couch in the corridor when there are no visitors. He allows only two of us in the toilet at once. And from the toilet he makes sure I return straight to the room. I can take no walks. Most of the day, I just lie in bed."

Sometimes his warders get rough with him. Two days earlier a nurse had insisted that Yevsyukov swallow pills, which he says are numbing. He refused, shutting his jaw tight. They first tried jamming the pills into his mouth. Then the orderly strapped him to the bed and employed two mentally ill inmates to help hold him down while they closed his nostrils and tried to force him to open his mouth. His nose bled. Finally they gave up and injected him instead—with a promise to repeat the process if he refused the pills the next time.

Seven days into his confinement, Yevsyukov said he was being shot up twice a day; later, after he grew weaker, his injections would be reduced to one a day. Lyudmila says she suspects that his warders plan to subject her father to a long hospitalization—and don't want him to become too ill. Yevsyukov always refuses to take pills. A nurse usually asks him to go into a special room where they administer the shots. He refuses. She then demands that he roll over. No reaction. The husky санитар forcibly rolls him over—and the nurse sticks Yevsyukov in the buttocks with the needle. Back to the fog.

Yevsyukov seems undaunted. His captors' strategy, as he tells it, is to rob him of his physical and mental energy and at the same time extract from him as much information as possible, so the KGB can later use it against him. His only weapon is silence. "My goal is not to listen to them and not talk to them," he says. Neither he nor his family has ever heard an explanation of Yevsyukov's alleged mental illness. "We never tell relatives anything about the diagnosis," Lyudmila reported the doctor as saying. At least once and as many as three times a day the doctor tries to question Yevsyukov on his background, his problems, his fears. He responds with fierce silence. Lyudmila is likewise uncooperative. "The worst thing that you can do for yourself is not speak to me," she says she was told by the doctor. "You aren't going to answer my questions," Lyudmila told her. "Why should I answer yours?"

Yevsyukov's optimism shows even through the drug-induced fog. "I know everything will eventually turn out all right," he says. "I can wait." But since he does not fall into any neat category of dissident, his future is less than promising. "The Western embassies tell us, 'You have no invitation to leave. You are not Jewish. You are not a divided family. There is nothing we can do for you,'" says Lyudmila. "They are killing us because we are a unique case. We just want to leave."

Out in the corridor, nurses chat with each other. Yevsyukov winked a gray-green eye in surreptitious appreciation of his daughter's visit. On the way off the floor, one of the plump guards stopped Lyudmila. "Did he talk to you?" she asked her. "Of course," Lyudmila told her. "Why doesn't he say anything to us? He doesn't say a single word. It's very bad." "Maybe he doesn't want to talk to you," Lyudmila replied. "Well, you ought to tell him to start talking to us." That was an order. It was met with the silence of a devoted and determined daughter.

Outside the building she looked back and saw a tall, sane man behind a barred window on the third floor. It was Yevsyukov waving goodbye with both arms, a drugged but unbroken man.

PARALYZED VETERANS ASSOCIATION'S EXPO

HON. DAN MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the Paralyzed Veterans Association's Expo for the Handicapped 1986, which is being held in Coral Springs, FL October 9-10.

This is a doubly gratifying moment, Mr. Speaker, because it permits me to recognize not only the Expo's organizers, but the far-ranging contributions of disabled persons to our community, our State and our Nation.

Today more than ever, the complex issues facing our society demand all our resources. Only by pooling our diverse talents will we meet these challenges, and that is why Expo 1986 is so vitally important. It signifies our resolve to work together, and to recognize that each of us has a unique gift that all should share.

This Expo, which is held each year in conjunction with National Employ the Handicapped Week, is an ideal opportunity for all Americans to rededicate themselves to ensuring that the handicapped enjoy the same opportunity for employment, education, social interaction, recreational facilities, quality medical care and other resources that are available to others.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in commending Committee Chairman George H. Snyder and his colleagues for their tireless work in this area. We salute them, and wish them every success in making Expo 1986 the most successful ever.

SANCTIONS, A CRUCIAL FIRST STEP

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Senate has now joined the House in declaring that the President's policy of constructive engagement is a total failure. Finally, a long awaited package of sanctions against South Africa is being sent to the President by Congress.

While this is certainly a very important step, there remains much more work to be done to establish meaningful dialog between blacks and whites in South Africa. We must continue to focus our attention on the situation there, and follow through with our commitment to bringing democracy to South Africa.

As we take this important first step, I would like to share with my colleagues two very well written pieces which support the decision we have made here today. The first was written by William Gould IV of the Stanford University Law School. Mr. Gould very forcefully, and correctly, states that Congress must take full responsibility for any and all United States sanctions against South Africa.

The second piece, written by Steven Phillips of the San Jose Mercury News, clearly explains the significance of the California State Legislature's decision to divest \$11.4 billion of State funds from United States firms doing business with South Africa. In his piece, Mr. Phillips explains clearly the practical effects, and strengths, of economic sanctions.

S. AFRICAN SANCTIONS, CAREFULLY CALIBRATED

(By William B. Gould IV)

South Africa's apartheid is the object of near universal condemnation in the United States. Its political and moral unacceptability is a reflection of our civil rights revolution which, while failing to eliminate a good deal of this country's discrimination, has made racism disreputable.

Yet this summer's debate about sanctions reflects an undercurrent of traditional racial attitudes held by the Reagan administration and its allies (including Britain's Thatcher government) on one side—and a streak of self-righteousness on the other. Sometimes the debate focuses more on how Americans can or should feel about themselves than on the conditions of South African blacks.

One need look no further than President Reagan's 1981 interview with Walter Cronkite, when he praised South Africa as a World War II ally, and his July 22 speech bestowing more accolades upon the Botha government's "reforms." Besides its "constructive engagement" policy toward South Africa, the Reagan administration's tax enforcement of civil rights in the United States, its opposition to affirmative action and its sponsorship of tax exemptions for segregated schools all belie Assistant Secretary of State Chester Crocker's assertion that this country is united behind common objectives *vis vis* South Africa and that the debate is exclusively implementation.

At the same time, unfocused moral indignation is demonstrated by statements such as that made by Sen. Lowell Weicker, R-

Conn., during a recent Public Broadcasting Corp. interview to the effect that the impact of sanctions doesn't matter—what matters is that we remain "true to our traditions."

It is, of course, vital that we disentangle the web of complicity so assiduously spun by the Reagan administration and some of its predecessors. The object, however, should not be catharsis for Americans, but rather the promotion of the interests of the black opposition and, to the limited extent possible, facilitation of a non-racial democracy.

Symbolism is always important in foreign policy. In this case it must be designed to distance us from the Botha government—which is hardly likely to rush into the open arms of the Soviet Union—and to establish a *modus vivendi* as well as friendship with its successors, regardless of ideology.

The United States must enact legislation containing sanctions against South Africa, in concert with our European allies if possible. Congress should pass a bill that is carefully calibrated to inflict both economic pressure and psychological isolation upon the South African regime—and that leaves us an opening to respond to a genuine dialogue between blacks and whites or the emergence of a representative government.

True, we should not "cut and run" as President Reagan has said. But we must do what little we can to promote a relatively peaceful transition.

The legislation should not call for the suspension of any sanction when the executive branch of government "certifies" that there has been "progress" in South Africa. Congress must take full responsibility. And Congress should opt for sanctions as the stick for any carrot, for three reasons:

The Reagan administration policy of constructive engagement is morally bankrupt, as it has given the Botha government respectability. This policy also has produced a complete dead end in South Africa, as the current state of emergency makes clear. It has not brought President P.W. Botha to the bargaining table with blacks. On the contrary, the government has grown more truculent than ever! As Bishop Desmond Tutu has said: "There is no guarantee that sanctions will topple apartheid, but it is the last nonviolent option left and it is a risk with a chance. President Reagan's policy of constructive engagement, and similar efforts to persuade white South Africans who support apartheid to change, have failed dismally."

All blacks, except Zulu chieftain Gatsha Buthelezi, overwhelmingly advocate sanctions. Indeed, the principal black trade union federation (Cosatu) has called for sanctions with full recognition that its members will be hurt first. Cosatu has judged that the suffering imposed by apartheid outweighs the relatively short-range economic harm done to blacks.

South Africa fears the discontent of both blacks and whites that will flow from sanctions. At some point, they could contribute to a turmoil that may, as foreign policy writer Connor Cruise O'Brien has suggested recently, lead to military intervention by the United Nations.

That is why South Africa fights sanctions so fiercely. That, along with the demographics of a swelling black majority, is why she has pushed so hard to institute modifications of apartheid through "reforms" demonstrating its good faith to the West.

The fact is that South Africa understands and responds well to the language of sanctions. Consider the government's reaction to

the sports boycott and its mild efforts to integrate, to avoid ostracism.

Nevertheless, the objections to sanctions are legion. Why single out South Africa?

As our actions against Nicaragua, Libya and the Soviet Union (in the wake of its invasion of Afghanistan) demonstrate, we frequently impose sanctions upon governments with morally repugnant policies. Moreover, our economic and military ties to South Africa make it a kind of creation of the West. We can influence it more effectively than most nations, and our conduct with it should therefore meet a higher standard.

Another reason why South Africa should be treated differently from the Soviet Union, for example, is that the racial injustice which permeates the former country is unique and abhorrent—an evil familiar in our own recent history.

A more formidable argument against sanctions is that they don't work. The experience with Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) and the arms embargo against South Africa are not encouraging. Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., says sanctions will topple the South African government and bring left-wing blacks to power, but this assertion is wildly simplistic.

The impact of sanctions is a long-range proposition. For starters, the United States would have to scrutinize the conduct of third parties, such as Israel, that are alleged to be transferring American assistance through channels with place arms, for instance, in the hands of South Africa.

The United States ought to enact legislation that will inflict economic pressure and psychological isolation upon the South African regime. The regime and many influential white citizens want and crave contact with the West. We should exploit this and exert pressure with our allies—Reagan's special relationship with Thatcher would be very useful here. Yet, some measure of contact should be preserved.

Contact could mean influence with a future government. Contrary to the urgings of some African National Congress representatives, diplomatic relations should not be broken with South Africa—or with any other country of which we disapprove. At a minimum, we need diplomatic relations to understand the injustice we should fight.

Nor should investment and trade be completely cut unless and until it is clear that measures such as those advocated here have had no effect. All of this is not intended to quarrel with the Dellums embargo on trade and investment passed by the House, which has moved the American dialogue forward—with a tremor sent through the business community.

But in 1986 our first genuine sanctions should be designed to offer a carrot. A primary reason for this approach is that a black-rule South Africa will need foreign multinationals and the export capacity that some of them possess. Part of newly independent Zimbabwe's economic success is attributable to such corporations' expertise and the fact that they, along with many white Zimbabwean farmers, did not up and leave.

But if, after 12 or 18 months, a Senate-House fact-finding team determines that the sanctions advocated below are not working and that the West is perceived by blacks to be on the wrong side, more drastic steps can then be taken. This could include divestiture, despite its harmful consequences.

Legislation enacted this year should contain the following elements:

A ban on all new investments in all forms of capital inflow. This is contained in a bill

introduced by Sen. Nancy Kassebaum, R-Kan., and it is an important first step in convincing South Africa that we will use economic pressure. Resumption of investment should not be conditioned upon any certification by the Reagan administration that the South African government has made any progress.

A boycott of all imports of coal, steel, uranium, cement and aluminum from South Africa's publically owned or "Para-statal" enterprises. This measure is contained in Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Richard Lugar's bill. It will deprive South Africa of badly needed foreign exchange and will have the additional benefit of placing our own nation in concert with boycotts that may be instituted at the European Economic Community's meeting in September. It might encourage EEC action along such lines.

A freeze on all South African bank accounts held in the United States. This will squeeze those whites who seek to depart from South Africa and thus pressure their government.

A cancellation of U.S. landing rights for South African Airways.

A ban on visas for South African parastatal officials. Such a ban should logically be extended to private citizens who propagate apartheid, just as South Africa excludes U.S. citizens whose views it finds uncongenial. But here again, the Reagan administration cannot be trusted.

An obligation for American companies still doing business in South Africa to bargain with black unions—the most important black opposition groups in South Africa—and to provide them with work place facilities. Theoretically, this has been done by the Sullivan Principles—to which numerous U.S. companies are signatory—but monitoring and enforcement of the principles have never materialized.

A sale of some of our reserve gold stocks, to depress gold prices. This step is advocated by the respected and conservative Economist of London.

Congress should explicitly pledge itself to provide foreign aid to compensate countries such as Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Zambia, which may suffer severe economic harm as a result of our sanctions, and which may endure South African reprisals in the form of deportation of their workers now employed in that country.

As I visited South Africa and met with black South African leaders in this country, there has been a constant refrain: "You Americans must get on the right side for a change." Sanctions would be an effective first step in that direction.

DIVESTITURE, A FIRST STEP—UNITED STATES FIRMS HELP MAINTAIN THE SOUTH AFRICA STATUS QUO

(By Steven C. Phillips)

Last week, the California State Legislature voted to divest \$11.4 billion of the state's funds from U.S. firms doing business with South Africa. Many people, including a majority of our own editorial board, think the action may have been ill-advised and impractical. Others of us think it was the right thing to do.

When asking, "Why divestiture?" it is imperative to understand the rule foreign investment plays in perpetuating apartheid. U.S. companies profit from that system and their taxes contribute to the maintenance of the economic status quo. In 1978, the Senate Foreign Relations committee con-

cluded that "the net effect of American investment has been to strengthen the economic and military self-sufficiency of South Africa's apartheid regime."

It is from the desire to remove foreign investment as a pillar of the apartheid system that the call for divestment has sprung. The divestment movement seeks to pressure U.S. corporations into withdrawing their holdings from South Africa.

How can the divestment of a few million dollars each from major multinational corporations induce those companies to pull out of an extremely profitable country? Some may say that divestment will have little effect. Viewed in narrow economic terms, such as a loss in the value of stock, it probably won't. Divestment, however, is more than an economic maneuver; it is a political action.

Where the California Legislature goes, other state legislatures and boards of trustees might well follow. And with enough investors of enough large blocks of stock pulling out their funds, that movement is sure to make waves at least in some corporate board rooms, if not on Wall Street.

The groundswell against apartheid already has risen beyond what organizers could have hoped a decade ago. With more groups demanding that their money not support companies dealing with South Africa, boards of directors will certainly review whether their policies are worth jeopardizing their public image, if not their profitability.

Public relations are important in the corporate world, and no company wants to be seen as supporting legalized racism. Highly publicized divestiture actions ensure that corporations continue to question their actions.

True, a consumer boycott of products may be more productive than simply divesting of stock that others may buy. But this is not an either-or choice. In expressing outrage at apartheid, divestiture is a simple, one-vote first step, compared with the efforts involved in organizing a long-term boycott.

A second practical result of divestiture is that it sends a strong message to the South African regime. Every act of divestment in the United States makes headlines in Pretoria and contributes to the international movement to isolate the apartheid regime.

With Ronald Reagan widely viewed as South Africa's last best friend, it is important to show that many official sectors of America are strongly opposed to the repression and denial of democracy in that country. State legislatures do not have the power to impose economic sanctions—perhaps the United States' most effective tool—against the Botha regime. Divestiture is, indeed, an indirect way to attack the evil of apartheid. But in a war in which our own federal government drags its feet, we choose the weapons, however small, at our disposal.

Divestiture also fuels the Free South Africa movement in this country. Historically, grass-roots pressure has produced changes in U.S. policy. In the past year, it has been the demonstrations on the campuses and in front of the South African embassies and consulates that have pushed this issue up on the national agenda.

Lastly, we must avoid arrogance as we seek to assist the struggle for freedom and democracy in South Africa. Ultimately, it will be the South Africans that free South Africa. Given that, we need to ask those working for change what kind of help we can offer. The answer, from Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the United Democratic

Front, the African National Congress, and the black trade unions is loud and clear: Withdraw foreign investment.

Divestment is one means to speed that withdrawal. It is not the only way. Rather than criticize it, we should embrace it and then suggest other ways to effect change.

There is no single, clear and easy path to ending apartheid. Neither is there time for self-satisfying, morally cleansing actions. We need to confront the political realities of the hour pragmatically, and respond to the urgency of the moment. Divestment marks only the beginning.

TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY BIVONA

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend Anthony Bivona, a man dedicated to the service of his community.

Tony Bivona, a fellow resident of Centerport, Long Island, retired this year after 22 years of service to the Deer Park School District as a teacher and speech pathologist. The school district and, more importantly, the students of the district will miss his dedication and energy.

But there are other sides to the community spirit shown by Tony Bivona, Mr. Speaker. He has given freely of his time to provide service to local hospitals and nursing homes. He developed and continues to direct an acclaimed summer recreation program for the handicapped in Huntington, a program he initiated while serving as town administrator. He also has served the people as a member of the Suffolk County Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to be able to call Tony Bivona my friend. I wish him well as he enters the next phase of his life, and commend him to my colleagues as a worthy example of the exemplary citizens among us.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, due to a longstanding commitment, I was unable to attend the session on Friday, August 15, 1986 and subsequently missed 12 rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Present" on rollcall No. 353, a quorum call;

"Aye" on rollcall No. 354, the Dickinson substitute amendment to the Hawkins amendment to H.R. 4428, which would have raised the threshold for applicability of the Davis-Bacon Act to \$250,000;

"Aye" on rollcall No. 355, the Hawkins amendment to H.R. 4428, to raise the threshold for applicability of the Davis-Bacon Act to \$25,000;

"Aye" on rollcall No. 356, the Solomon amendment to H.R. 4428, to clarify that

former members of the armed services who were honorably discharged, or permanently handicapped cannot be refused Federal benefits for having failed to register for the draft;

"Aye" on rollcall No. 357, the Dickinson motion to recommit H.R. 4428 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report it back containing an amendment to permit use of Armed Forces for interdiction of narcotics and with the following amendments deleted: the Aspin amendment relating to nuclear testing, the Dicks amendment relating to SALT II, the Brown of California amendment relating to anti-satellite weapons, and the Porter amendment relating to chemical munitions;

"Nay" on rollcall No. 358, final passage of H.R. 4428, the Department of Defense Authorization;

"Nay" on rollcall No. 359, a separate vote on the Waxman amendment to H.R. 3129, to prohibit the Department of Transportation from contracting for construction of the Los Angeles metro rail;

"Aye" on rollcall No. 360, the McEwen motion to recommit H.R. 3129 to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation with instructions to report it back containing an amendment to take the Highway Trust Fund off budget;

"Nay" on rollcall No. 361, final passage of H.R. 3129, the Surface Transportation Authorization;

"No" on rollcall No. 362, to agree to Senate amendment No. 1 and disagree to Senate amendment No. 2 to H.R. 5395, to increase the statutory limit on the public debt;

"No" on rollcall No. 363, to table the motion to reconsider H.R. 5395; and

"Nay" on rollcall No. 364, motion to adjourn until noon on Monday, September 8, 1986.

EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE IN LOUISIANA

HON. JOHN B. BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, today, 272 public and private schools are being recognized by the Department of Education for educational excellence. This honor is being bestowed on these schools for their effective educational programs.

Of the 272 schools being honored today, 7 are from Louisiana. Four of these schools are public schools. Three of them are private schools. I salute them for their outstanding work in educating our young students.

Two of Louisiana's seven schools being recognized today are from the Seventh Congressional District. They are St. Michael's Catholic School, at Crowley, and Our Lady of Fatima, at Lafayette. As Representative of the Seventh District, I wish to bring this award to the attention of the House and to applaud them for achieving it.

As a former student of St. Michael's and a graduate of St. Michael's High School, I am proud to see it receive this recognition.

Particular attention should be given to all those who contribute to and work so hard on

behalf of educational excellence at these schools. For the students, the faculty and staff, the parents, and the others who participate in the school's program, this honor will always be valued and treasured. Let it serve, too, as a challenge for the future, to continue the effective education for which they have been recognized.

Let this be an occasion, too, to renew our commitment to outstanding achievement in education, at all levels, as it is so important and vital to this Nation, now and in the years ahead.

CATASTROPHIC OUT-OF-POCKET MEDICAL COSTS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, nearly 16 million American families, or about one family in five, incur catastrophic out-of-pocket medical costs each year, according to a recent study funded by the National Center for Health Services Research. The study found that people suffering catastrophic costs—greater than 5 percent of the family's gross income—were of two types: Those who had good health insurance but had very large costs beyond their coverage, and families for whom relatively small out-of-pocket expenses represented a high percentage of their income due to a combination of low and inadequate or nonexistent health care coverage.

In many cases, Mr. Speaker, catastrophic medical costs stem from long-term care for an elderly patient. An estimated 6.6 million Americans 65 and older require long-term care. Of the elderly over 84 years of age, 22 percent are institutionalized. Moreover, the elderly population is increasing in record numbers. Life expectancy at birth has reached a new high of 74.6 years.

In general, America's families are shouldering the burdens of paying for long-term care with their personal financial resources. In fact, 40 percent of nursing home care is paid for from private sources. Insurance policies for long-term care are available, but only a small fraction of Americans have taken advantage of them.

This may be because many older Americans mistakenly believe that Medicare covers nursing home care. A 1983 survey by the American Association of Retired Persons, for example, showed that 79 percent of those who thought they might enter a nursing home erroneously believed Medicare would pay all or part of the bill.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that Medicare pays only for short-term stays—up to 100 days. It does not cover custodial long-term care. Medicaid, the joint Federal-State health plan for the poor, does pay for nursing home care.

But Medicaid was designed to help only the truly needy. Before it will pay, patients must be poor already or spend down their assets to

meet strict eligibility standards. Sadly, once a person is in a nursing home, that process does not take very long.

Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Aging found that 63 percent of older Americans with no spouse impoverish themselves after only 13 weeks in a nursing home. According to that same study, 83 percent become impoverished within a year.

Having realized the magnitude of the problem of paying for long-term care, Congress, the White House, and the private sector are seeking appropriate means to pay for catastrophic health care. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has formed a task force to study private sector alternatives. The President's Blue Ribbon Panel will issue a report by the end of the year. In addition, budget reconciliation legislation that became law in April called for an 18-month study by a new task force to recommend long-term care policies to Congress and State governments.

Current proposals in Congress range from expansion of Medicare coverage to include an optional part C; to medical IRAs; to tax deductions for the care at home of chronically ill, elderly family members. Most of these proposals are vehicles for discussion of possible ways the public and private sectors can meet the vast need for a long-term care policy.

Once the various task forces, commissions, and private sector groups have completed a comprehensive examination, including study by the Select Committee on Aging, I believe there will be a consensus here in Congress to take action on this vital issue.

GATT TALKS

HON. DAN MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, beginning next Monday, trade ministers from 92 nations will open a new round of global trade talks in Punta Del Este, Uruguay. The great need for a renegotiation of the general agreement on tariffs and trade [GATT] is indisputable. I strongly support U.S. Trade Representative Clayton Yeutter's stance as we enter the talks.

Yeutter has clearly expressed U.S. priorities for the GATT talks. They include: an end to agricultural subsidies; stricter prohibitions against piracy of intellectual property; a halt to barriers to trade in service industries such as banking and insurance; free flow of investment funds; and revision of the GATT dispute settlement mechanism.

GATT has served the world well since its inception in January 1948. It has promoted large-scale trade liberalization and fostered economic growth and higher living standards. However, GATT must adapt to changing world conditions if it is to survive. Consideration and adoption of reforms proposed by the U.S.

Trade Representative is imperative to this survival.

A WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY TO SOLVE TIMBER PRICING PROBLEMS

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, the key to economic health in the Pacific Northwest is a healthy, vibrant timber industry. Over the last 5 years, Canada has cornered a growing portion of the timber market previously serviced by Americans. Why? The primary factor is a pricing imbalance that some have called a blatant Canadian subsidy.

I am not here to call names or make charges. But I think that we have a window of opportunity between now and October 9 of this year to pursue a strategy that could help both American and Canadian timber interests.

On October 9, 1986, the Commerce Department will arrive at a decision in a countervailing duty case as to whether Canada subsidizes its timber prices. If that decision finds that there is a subsidy, a heavy tariff—that some say may be 27 percent—will be applied to all timber coming into the U.S. from Canada, and the trade war begins.

The solution does not lie in an identical pricing system, but it might lie in one which ultimately connects the prices of our two countries: a common stumpage pricing system. Over the last 5 years, the effective exchange rate between the U.S. and Canada has been relatively stable. With attention paid to maintaining that balanced exchange rate, a common pricing system—leading to a freer and fairer timber market—should be within our grasp. Thus united, we might even be able to address our mutual concerns of Japanese tariffs and untapped markets.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be facing a choice between submitting to an unfair subsidy or unleashing a harsh tariff. And yet, that's the direction we seem to be headed. Secretary Malcolm Baldrige, together with U.S. Trade Representative Clayton Yeutter, are in the best position to create a third choice, but it hasn't been done.

I can think of no better time to move into high gear than the present. The ruling on October 9 provides a window of opportunity to solve this trade dilemma. What better reason can be given Canada to negotiate than to avoid this big "sanctions" stick?

It is high time that this administration recognized that its negotiating positions have been ineffective. We have the tools to put our trading partners' feet to the fire and negotiate some real solutions. But unless the administration acts quickly, in this window of opportunity, we will have lost the chance to achieve an innovative solution to our timber pricing problems.

LEGISLATION TO CALL IN THE
\$100 BILL

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, everyone agrees the Congress must take strong, decisive action to attack the drug epidemic which is destroying our youth and fueling the crime rate in our communities. The House recently took a major step toward arresting this plague when it passed overwhelmingly H.R. 5848, the Omnibus Drug Enforcement, Education, and Control Act which is now before the Senate. I believe the Congress must continue to search for other avenues to stop the drug trade and put drug traffickers behind bars.

Recently I had the opportunity to visit with my good friend, Jerry Finkelstein, the publisher of the New York Law Journal. Mr. Finkelstein had an excellent idea which I believe would go a long way toward identifying drug traffickers and drying up their illegal profits. His idea is very simple: Call in the \$100 bill.

Currently, there are approximately four \$100 bills in circulation for every man woman and child in this country. However, few Americans carry \$100 bills in their wallet. Most large retail purchases are made by check or credit. In fact, more than 90 percent of consumer and business transactions are handled by checks. Only small retail purchases are routinely made with cash.

Where are all the \$100 bills? The vast majority of \$100 bills held domestically and internationally are in the hands of big-time drug traffickers, loan sharks, tax evaders, gangsters, and other law breakers.

The \$100 bill is the currency of the drug trade. In most drug busts, it is not uncommon for police to find suitcases or brown paper sacks stuffed with \$100 bills. A drug dealers need for large denominations of cash is obvious. Cash eliminates bank records which would lead law enforcement officials straight to the criminals. Under current law, banks are required to report large cash transactions. Also, large denominations make it easy for drug dealers to transport the billions of dollars in which they deal. Quite simply, \$100 bills make the drug dealer's life that much easier.

Today, I am introducing legislation to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to promptly recall the \$100 bill. This legislation will take from the drug dealer one of his most vital resources—a convenient medium of exchange.

My legislation would simply require the Treasury Secretary, within 30 days after enactment, to use his existing authority to recall the \$100 bill. The legislation would also authorize the Secretary to issue regulations to facilitate such a recall and to provide for the minting of replacement \$100 bills in a different form.

Calling in \$100 bills would send fear through the hearts of big time druggushers. They would be forced to come to the surface to turn in their old hundreds for new money, and our law enforcement officials will be waiting. If they failed to do so they would lose hundreds of millions of dollars made through this deadly trade.

Mr. Speaker, we must stop drug pushers from poisoning our children and threatening our society. Eliminating their primary medium of exchange would help to do just that. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this important bill. By enacting this simple, straightforward proposal, we can drive a big spike into the heart of the drug trade in the United States.

KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN'S
CHURCH OF GOD'S CENTENNIAL

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay special tribute to Kalamazoo, Michigan's Church of God on the occasion of its centennial celebration.

In 1886, with the visit of a traveling evangelist, Sebastian Michels, to Kalamazoo, came the Church of God movement to Michigan. One of the attendees of Michel's tent worship meeting was William Ralph Hartman, who was so moved by the gatherings that he decided to become pastor of the Church of God, in which capacity he continued to serve for 51 years. The group of six converts grew steadily until 1908 when, with 60 members, the first church building was erected on Ransom Street.

There are many dates important to the history of the Westwood Church of God: 1920, when a new 200-seat, brick building was built, completely financed through freewill offerings; 1960, when a newer church was constructed at its current location on Gorham Lane; 1966, when the church "mothered" a new congregation on the south side of town serving 30 families from the established congregation; 1977, when the current senior pastor and his wife, Tom and Jean Tufts, began their service; and November 1981, when the rebuilding of the sanctuary, which had been demolished by a tornado on May 13, 1980, was completed.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Westwood Church of God take understandable pride in their history and in the strength of their faith. The centennial celebration commemorates the church's founding and serves to demonstrate its sense of the history and its confidence in its future. I am privileged to represent the members of the Westwood Church of God and to work with constituents who use the celebration of their history as a means of recommitting and rededicating themselves to their religious heritage and to service to their community.

PESTICIDE RESISTANCE
AMENDMENT TO FIFRA

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing an amendment which I plan to offer when the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act comes to the floor next week.

While H.R. 2482, as amended by H.R. 5440, provides important new provisions, it does not address one issue which will increasingly confront farmers and environmentalists in the years to come: the alarming increase in the number of insects and other pests which have grown resistant to pesticides and can no longer be controlled or killed.

Entire classes of once highly effective pesticide compounds have been rendered entirely useless. Indeed, seventeen species of insects are now resistant to all of the five classes of pesticide compounds in existence—including most recent products of sophisticated research. Already, we no longer have any effective pesticides against some major crop pests. In Long Island, for example, potato farmers have no effective pesticide against one of the crop's major insects.

The prestigious National Academy of Sciences has warned, in a 1986 report, that: "The bright future for crop protection and public health as a result of the introduction of synthetic organic pesticides is now open to serious question because of an alarming increase in * * * resistance."

Our traditional answer to pesticide resistance—switching to a new pesticide—is rapidly becoming impossible. The chemical industry has nearly exhausted the potential of traditional chemical pesticides. Finding new effective chemical pesticides is becoming more difficult—and more expensive. The number of new pesticides introduced has dropped sharply in the last several years.

Making this problem all the more difficult is the fact that many pests that develop resistance to one group of chemicals also turn out to be resistant to other groups of pesticides. Almost half of the arthropod species are resistant to more than one out of the existing five classes of chemical pesticides, sharply reducing the present possibilities of pest control.

The tragedy in human terms is brought home vividly by the World Health Organization's ill-fated attempt in the 1970's to eradicate malaria mosquitoes by widespread use of DDT. The mosquitoes are now widely resistant to DDT, and malaria is surging back to epidemic levels. Unfortunately, scientists fear that DDT-resistant genes will also protect mosquitoes against the last possible class of insecticide.

Fortunately, scientists all over the world are working on pesticide management techniques which can greatly retard the development of pesticide resistance. For example, the National Academy of Sciences' report suggests a number of alternative strategies for pesticide management, including alternating, rotating, or developing new sequences for pesticide applications.

The amendment I have proposed would give EPA, for the first time, explicit authority to address this urgent problem. The amendment will direct the EPA to establish a Pesticide Resistance Management Program to conduct research and testing on management methods to control pesticide resistance. The amendment also directs EPA, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, to share the information developed by the program with all involved parties, including farmers, farmer orga-

nizations, manufacturers, and pesticide applicators.

While the coalition supporting H.R. 2482 is generally opposing floor amendments, I am encouraged to know that the coalition, including the National Agricultural Chemicals Association, has no objection to this amendment.

Pesticide resistance cannot be dismissed as a future problem. The problem is now. Unless we take action now to reduce the explosive growth of resistance to pesticides, we may find ourselves in the 21st century facing an exhausted chemical arsenal against pests, and the prospect of suffering the 19th century ravages of nature on our health, our crops, and our environment.

I urge my colleagues to support this very modest step to address this most serious problem.

ACTION AGAINST APARTHEID CANNOT BE DELAYED

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the apartheid system of racial oppression in South Africa must be abolished. It is an immoral and unjust system. It is an affront to human dignity, and that is why the House must vote to impose strong sanctions against South Africa.

Although I support the stronger language contained in the original House-passed bill, I am voting for the sanctions contained in the bill before us today.

The President's policy of constructive engagement has proven to be an embarrassing failure. It has utterly failed to move the South African Government toward an end to apartheid. Instead, the Botha Government continues to write a tragic history of oppression, violence, and death.

Together with other nations, we need to send a strong signal—and this bill is that message.

We must help bring to a close this sorry chapter of the Pretoria Government's inhumanity to its people, and of our own Government's insensitivity to the horrible suffering being endured by the vast majority of South Africans.

Admittedly, this bill does not contain all that we wanted. But it does light a long-dimmed candle for the oppressed in South Africa.

And the strong, bipartisan support behind this bill will hopefully persuade even the President—who has threatened to veto this legislation—that the time has come to say "No More" to apartheid.

This bill does not preempt any State or locality from enforcing even stronger divestiture and disinvestment legislation, such as the new law we have enacted in my own State of California. I support that action, and wish the Congress would have agreed to legislation more along its lines.

Apartheid must be confronted head-on. It is a morally repugnant symbol of repression, a disease that must be eradicated once and for all.

SHAVING THE NOTCH

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, this week, nearly 1,000 senior citizens rallied on the steps of the Capitol in support of legislation to correct the Social Security notch inequity. These 1,000 citizens represent 10 million Americans who are unfairly treated under the Social Security system because they were born during the "notch" years of 1917 through 1921.

As a result of changes in the Social Security law in 1977, beneficiaries born in 1917 and later receive significantly lower benefits than those born in 1916. The 1977 law was enacted to correct an error in the Social Security benefit formula enacted in 1972 that would have provided overly generous benefits to future retirees. Unfortunately, in correcting the formula, a "notch" was created in which individuals born months, weeks, and even days apart receive widely disparate benefits.

I am sure that our colleagues have all heard from many constituents who are receiving hundreds of dollars less in Social Security benefits than they should be just because they were born during the notch years. We are aware that an injustice exists for these Social Security retirees. This is not a question as to whether an inequity exists; it is a question of whether or not the cost of correcting this inequity will jeopardize Social Security.

The fact is that the Social Security funds can afford this modification and this legislation will in no way jeopardize the stability of Social Security. It is estimated that Social Security trust funds will have large surpluses in the future, totaling \$186 billion by 1990. The estimated cost of correcting the notch inequity, including \$22 billion in retroactive benefits, may be as high as \$80 billion over the next 5 years. This is a significant cost, however, we can correct the notch and still expect Social Security trust fund reserves to exceed \$100 billion in 1990—a more than twofold increase over today's Social Security reserve level.

Opponents of this legislation argue that correcting the notch will increase the budget deficit. The truth of the matter is that this legislation will reveal more of the true deficit but it would have no actual effect on the deficit. Social Security is independently funded from employee and employer payroll taxes on a "pay as you go" basis. The Social Security system is not responsible for any of our national debt, however, surpluses in Social Security trust funds are now being used as a shield to make the budget picture seem brighter. As my colleagues are aware, using the surplus to offset the deficit is deceptive and should not be permitted. In July, the House passed legislation which would prevent this deception and other injustices by reestablishing the Social Security Administration [SSA] as an independent agency. I congratulate all of you who supported H.R. 5050 to prevent injustices in the SSA. Now I urge your support for H.R. 1917 to correct an injustice in the Social Security payment system.

The 1,000 citizens who came to Washington to protest and the 5 million Americans

who signed petitions to correct the notch inequity, brought a powerful message to Washington this week. Due in part to their efforts, H.R. 1917 now has more than 150 cosponsors, and the list of supporters is growing.

Soon, the notch protestors will leave the Capitol, but their message to Congress will remain: We must address this inequity by shaving the notch and restoring just treatment to 10 million of our Nation's senior citizens.

PROPOSALS ON CONTROLLING DRUGS PRESENTED BY MAYOR THEODORE MANN OF NEWTON, MA

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Theodore Mann of the city of Newton, MA, recently presented to the task force on drug control of the United States Conference of Mayors, the report on drugs compiled by the executive department of the city of Newton. An ad hoc committee with membership representing the public schools, representatives of drug treatment facilities, and citizens of various sorts, presented a comprehensive program which the mayor has passed along to the Conference of Mayors.

I'm impressed by the thoughtful and dedicated work of this committee. I commend Mayor Mann for this latest example of his strong leadership on difficult and important issues, and I ask that the text of the mayor's transmission letter and the accompanying report be printed here.

CITY OF NEWTON, MA,

Newton Centre, MA, September 5, 1986.

The TASK FORCE ON DRUG CONTROL,
U.S. Conference of Mayors, Washington, DC.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The enclosed report on the subject of drugs was compiled by the Executive Department of the City of Newton in preparation for the first meeting of the Task Force in Washington, DC, on September 8, 1986.

I share with you the results of Newton's ad hoc committee's work. The membership included representatives of the Newton Public Schools, principals of major drug treatment facilities in the northeast, and citizens interested in assisting all levels of government in advancing programs that will help deal with the spectrum of issues involved in drug control.

Further information from any of the sources mentioned herein would be made available to the USCM Task Force, as would representatives of the several organizations which made such significant contributions to the preparation of this report and its recommendations.

Sincerely,

THEODORE D. MANN,

Mayor.

MAYOR'S AD HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE

PREAMBLE

Whereas, an estimated 20 million people in the United States have used cocaine, and

Whereas, approximately 5 million people are regular users and 2 million are cocaine-dependent; and

Whereas, it is estimated that Americans spend more money on drugs than they spend on food; and

Whereas, the only age group for which the death rate increases each year is 15-25 years old; and

Whereas, 71 percent of the three largest causes of death in this group (accidents, suicides, and homicides) are related to alcohol and drug abuse; and

Whereas, over thirty billion dollars are spent each year on cocaine alone; and

Whereas, one out of fourteen high school seniors uses marijuana daily: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a comprehensive approach to the problem is necessary, and the following recommendations are to be submitted for consideration to the Task Force on Drug Control of the United States Conference of Mayors.

Sources include: The Surgeon General's Report to the Nation; National Institute of Drug Abuse Alcohol and Drug Problems Association of North America; and the Mediplex Group.

RECOMMENDED SEVEN POINT PROGRAM

1. Comprehensive plan to attack the supply of drugs, nationally and internationally.

Cooperation with other nations to defeat international drug trafficking, including economic sanctions on all countries which do not cooperate with United States rules and regulations concerning herbicides and drug growing.

Federal and state legislation to support the plan.

2. Strengthening of law enforcement efforts.

Coordination of federal, state, and local enforcement agencies—creation of a super-agency (include military) at the federal level to implement plan.

Prompt and severe penalties for drug sellers, including mandatory sentencing beginning with first offense.

Federal funding for courts and facilities—additional judges, as well as other enforcement personnel, as needed to implement plan.

Confiscation of property of drug sellers and buyers (a possible funding source for financing the plan).

3. Public education and awareness campaigns.

Disseminate appropriate information warning of the dangers posed by drug abuse.

Expansion of drug abuse education as part of health curriculum; mandatory in grades K through 12. (Please note enclosed: "Newton Task Force on Alcohol & Drugs—Presentation to School Committee—March 5, 1986; draft of "A Parent's Guide to Teen Parties;" and Statement of Concern published in newsletter of Newton Council of PTAs.)

Involve media in public awareness programs.

Local programs to educate parents and members of the public. (For an example, see the enclosed description of the Newton Youth Drug/Alcohol Program.)

Teacher training in drug education—for public and private schools, colleges and universities, and in educational programs geared to public and private business enterprises. (Enclosed is job description for Health Education/Substance Abuse Specialist in the Newton Public Schools.)

4. Identification/Intervention campaigns. School-based intervention programs to identify "at risk" students, evaluate abusers, and refer them for appropriate treatment.

Employee assistance programs in private and public sectors to identify and refer employees to appropriate resources. (A model plan has been developed by Abruzzi Enterprises of Newton, which includes employee awareness programs and a reward system.)

Criminal justice screening units in both juvenile and adult systems.

5. Treatment resources to be developed in both the private and public sector.

Expansion of insurance benefits for drug/alcohol treatment by mandated state and federal law.

Expansion of coverage for Health Maintenance Organizations by appropriate state and federal law.

Additional funding at federal and state levels for treatment programs for the uninsured.

Expansion of Titles 19, and 20 coverage to include alcohol and drug abuse free-standing rehabilitation facilities.

6. Drug testing programs for private and public enterprises which deal with public safety.

7. Co-sponsor a national conference on "Combating Drug Abuse in the 1980's: A Cooperative Effort." This effort could be a cooperative one among Robert M. Stutman, Special Agent in Charge, New York office of the Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice; Matt Green and Joan Green, consultants with Sameem Associates, a private consulting agency for drug and alcohol issues, located in the greater Boston area; and The Mediplex Group, Inc., Alcohol and Substance Abuse Division, also in the greater Boston area.

THE FUTURE OF ARKANSAS FARMERS DISCUSSED IN URUGUAY

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the future of Arkansas farmers will be discussed in Uruguay next week when member nations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] will meet to set the schedule for the next round of multilateral trade negotiations. Agriculture must be put at the very top of the agenda. Our U.S. representatives in their insistence on this top priority for agriculture, must be as hard as a pawnbroker's smile.

And, our representatives must be as relentless as the passage of time in their demand that the negotiations on agriculture issues be put on a fast track toward final agreements.

American agriculture policy and, to an important degree, farmer production decisions are rooted in the assumption that U.S. agriculture products will be exported. The health of our farm sector, as it exists today, depends on being able to sell into the international market place approximately one-third of our production. But, during the past 6 years, exports of our farm products have dropped 37 percent. Current estimates for this year put us dangerously on the edge of, if not already into, the Death Valley days of importing more agriculture products than we export.

Since the beginning of this current Presidential administration we have received repeated pie crust promises that agriculture will be right at the head of the table in international trade negotiations. It is time that the pie crust gets a fresh, healthy filling of performance.

The GATT negotiations are not the end all be all panacea for the problems U.S. farm exports are encountering. Of course, they are not. Unlike 1973 when we had a world food shortage crisis, today there is a maldistributed abundance of food supplies. And, the persistent over-valuation of the U.S. dollar against foreign currencies has been a problem; but, progress has been made in resolving that one. The 1973 and 1975 embargoes on farm exports and the 1974 restrictions on those exports shook world confidence in U.S. reliability as a supplier and encouraged a rise in new competitors in world markets. We have made progress in overcoming those problems.

But, the GATT mechanism can be of major importance in resolving such unfair trade practices as export subsidies and quantitative import restrictions. American farmers are efficient. Our farmers produce more high quality agriculture products than any other nation in the world. Our farmers can be competitive, under fair rules, with those of any other nation in the world.

But, if the deck is stacked against our agriculture exports—as in the case of variable levees where foreign governments continually jiggle the charges against our products—our farmers face unbearable odds in the marketplace.

In the arena of non-tariff barriers, where GATT negotiations could be helpful, some of our trading partners—such as the European Economic Community and Japan—have shown as much conscience as a hungry fox in a hen house.

TRIBUTE TO DR. GABRIEL S. SINISI

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Dr. Gabriel S. Sinisi as he becomes the 120th president of the Bergen County Medical Society.

A graduate of Seton Hall University, New York University, and Fairleigh Dickinson University, Sinisi received his medical degree from the University of Guadalajara, in Mexico. A member of the American College of Physicians, he serves on the staff of Holy Name Hospital in Teaneck. He is a 32d degree Mason.

Dr. Sinisi serves his community with a deep sense of commitment. We wish him well during his tenure as president of the Bergen County Medical Society.

**MEDICARE DEVICE
IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1986**

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H.R. 5516, the "Medical Device Improvement Act of 1986." When the medical device amendments were originally introduced 10 years ago, they established a comprehensive scheme for the regulation of medical devices that has provided substantial protection to the American public in absolutely essential ways.

We in the Congress have monitored the implementation and administration of these amendments during the past decade. Although the act remains essentially sound, certain problems have become evident that need to be addressed. In particular, the Food and Drug Administration has been forced to spend excessive amounts of time and effort working on matters that are relatively trivial while ignoring other, more important, projects because of some unnecessarily burdensome requirements in the act.

H.R. 5516 would modify these portions of the law to permit the agency greater discretion to redirect its energies into more productive and essential activities. The legislation would not make any changes that would lessen the public's protection from unsafe or ineffective devices.

Mr. Speaker, we are late in the session and I recognize that time pressures and pure logistics may prevent passage of the bill in the 99th Congress. On the other hand, I am concerned enough about the need for modifying the law that I am prepared to try to move the bill this year. The legislation was prepared in close consultation with representatives of the Food and Drug Administration, Contact Lens Manufacturers Association, the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, Health Industry Manufacturers Association, consumer representatives, and others.

In order to reach consensus on this legislation the subcommittee stands willing to consider any reasonable changes in this current bill. I invite Members to review H.R. 5516 and would appreciate any comments or suggestions. Should passage of the legislation not be possible before the Congress adjourns, the subcommittee will seek consideration of similar legislation in the next Congress.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

**CELEBRATING THE AMERICAN
CAR**

HON. MARJORIE HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, each year, the Laurel, MD, Lions Club sponsors an automobile show to raise funds for its various charitable endeavors.

This year's event was the 22d annual Laurel Lions Auto Show, and 827 antique, classic, and special cars were displayed at Laurel Race Course. An estimated 7,000 to 8,000 visitors attended. Richard Jesneck, Lions chairman, and Ron Xifo, show chairman, deserve great credit.

Of special interest at the event was the large assembly of DeSoto automobiles brought to Laurel for the first annual convention of the National DeSoto Club. The occasion also marked the 10th anniversary of the Maryland DeSoto Club led by J. Francis Werne. On display were the largest number of DeSotos assembled in one place since the manufacturer ceased production on November 30, 1960.

Mr. Speaker, 1986 marks the 100th anniversary of the gasoline-powered automobile. It is said that Americans have a love affair with their cars, and it is true that we love the mobility provided by the automobile.

To visit the Laurel Auto Show and behold the beautifully restored cars of the past is to visit an important part of American history. I congratulate the Lions Club, the DeSoto Club, and the other auto enthusiasts who made the Laurel event such a great success.

**AWARD OF CARNEGIE HERO
FUND COMMISSION MEDAL**

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during a heavy rainfall and flood, an act of heroism on the part of Mr. Benny Gracy, chief of the volunteer fire department of the city of Rockwall, TX, resulted in the posthumous award of the prestigious Carnegie Hero Fund Commission medal to that gentleman. The award was made to Mrs. Edith Gracy, the mother of the deceased, who resides in McKinney, TX.

The following is a transcript of the circumstances surrounding the act of heroism for which the medal was awarded:

Carnegie Medal awarded to Benny Gracy, who died helping attempt to save Charles W. and Billy J. Christmas from drowning, Rockwall, Texas, April 27, 1985. Charles, 94, and his son Billy were passengers in a car

September 12, 1986

that was stranded by the rising floodwaters of Buffalo Creek. Gracy, 32, sanitation company operations manager who was also chief of the volunteer fire department, responded to the scene, where he waded to the car to assist a deputy sheriff who had secured a hold on Charles. Before Gracy and the deputy could remove Charles from the car, the force of the water lifted the car and pulled it into the creek, where it lodged against the opening of a 300-foot-long culvert. Charles drowned. Gracy, Billy, and the deputy were pulled by the current through the culvert. Billy and the deputy were able to leave the creek, but Gracy drowned.

It is fitting and proper that this tribute to the heroism and courage of Mr. Benny Gracy should be recognized by the House of Representatives through inclusion in the House RECORD.

**THE TURKISH SYNAGOGUE
MASSACRE**

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 12, 1986

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deepest sympathy for the victims of the recent massacre of Turkish Jews in Istanbul's central synagogue. This attack was an act of murderous terrorism, repugnant to all members of the world community.

We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that this was not an attack directed solely against Jews. It was an assault upon everything human and decent, an act of violence against innocent civilians. Terrorists claim that they are freedom fighters, yet they commit horrible acts in the furtherance of their cause. The truly freedom-loving people of the world are not the allies of these people, but their victims.

Just as all Americans were hurt by the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., so too are members of the world community hurt when innocent people are murdered. The world's spiritual leaders have an absolute duty to come together as one body to unite people of all faiths against senseless violence. They must speak out as one voice in affirming the morality of peaceful coexistence and peaceful change.

Mr. Speaker, let us understand that two of this century's greatest freedom fighters were men of peace. Martin Luther King and Mohatma Gandhi freed their people through peaceful and uncompromising revolution. They never resorted to acts of desperation despite the extreme acts of violence directed at their followers.

Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and Muslims must remember this legacy for the sake of all people. I urge my colleagues to help build this new consensus.